arXiv:math/0605290v2 [math.SG] 8 Jul 2007

Constructing virtual Euler cycles and classes

Guangcun Lu*
Department of Mathematics,
Beijing Normal University, China
(gclu@bnu.edu.cn)

Gang Tian
Department of Mathematics,
Princeton University and Beijing University
(tian@math.princeton.edu)

First version May 10, 2006
Revisied July 5, 2007

Abstract

The constructions of the virtual Euler (or moduli) cycles and their properties are explained and developed systematically in the general abstract settings.

Contents

0 Introduction 2

1 The Euler cycle of Banach Fredholm bundles 5
- 1.1 The construction of the Euler cycles 5
- 1.2 Localization formula 16
- 1.3 Properties 18

2 The virtual Euler cycles of Banach Fredholm orbibundles 27
- 2.1 Banach orbifolds and orbibundles 27
- 2.2 An overall strategy and an example 38
- 2.3 The resolutions of Banach orbibundles near a compact subset 43
  - 2.3.1 A general resolution 43
  - 2.3.2 Renormalization of the resolution in (2.58) 62
- 2.4 Transversality 66

---

*The first author is partially supported by the NNSF 10371007 of China and the Program for New Century Excellent Talents of the Education Ministry of China.

2.4.1 Local transversality 67
2.4.2 Global transversality 68
2.5 Orientation 80
2.6 Virtual Euler cycle and class 83
2.6.1 The dependence on choices of sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ 87
2.6.2 The dependence on choices of W_i 89
2.7 Localization formula and restriction principle 92
2.8 Properties 101

3 The Euler cycle of the partially smooth Banach Fredholm bundle 112

4 Virtual Euler chains and cycles of PS Banach Fredholm orbibundles 138
4.1 A general framework 138
4.2 Framework I 149
4.3 Framework II 165

A Appendix: Banach manifolds with corners 169

B Appendix: Slice theorem for actions of Lie groups on Banach manifolds 174

C Appendix: Three results on linear functional analysis 176

D Appendix: Existence of partially smooth cut-off functions in GW-theory 178

0 Introduction

In many mathematical studies, one encounters the following **Moduli Problem**: $E \to X$ is a vector bundle and $S : X \to E$ is a section, the zero locus $Z(S) := S^{-1}(0)$ contains a lot of information of about the triple (X, E, S).

A classical differential topology fact is: If X is a closed smooth manifold of finite dimension and $E \to X$ is a smooth vector bundle, then a generic smooth section $S : X \to E$ is transversal to the zero section and $Z(S)$ is a closed submanifold of X which is a representative cycle of the Poincaré dual of the Euler class of E.

For the general moduli problem above it is expected to get some analogies. A nice historical discussion of work related to this question can be found in the introduction of [CMSa]. The goal of this paper is to explain and study constructions and properties of (virtual) Euler chains and classes of the following four kinds models of moduli problems.

I. (X, E, S) is a **Banach Fredholm bundle** of index r and with compact zero locus. Namely, X is a separable Banach manifold, $E \to X$ is a

Banach vector bundle and S is a Fredholm section of index r and with compact zero locus. When the determinant bundle $\det(S) \to Z(S)$ is oriented, i.e., it is trivializable and is given a continuous section nowhere zero, (X, E, S) is said to be **oriented**.

II. (X, E, S) is a **Banach Fredholm orbibundle** of index r and with compact zero locus. Namely, X is a separable Banach orbifold, $E \to X$ is a Banach orbibundle and S is a Fredholm section of index r and with compact zero locus. (X, E, S) is called **oriented** if the determinant bundle $\det(S) \to Z(S)$ is oriented, (cf. §2.1 for precise definition).

III. Roughly speaking, (X, E, S) consists of a separable PS (partially smooth) Banach manifold (Def.3.1), a PS Banach bundle $E \to X$ (Def.3.4) and a PS section $S : X \to E$ which has a compact zero locus $Z(S)$ and whose restriction to each stratum is Fredholm and restrictions to the lower strata have less indexes. (See Def.3.5 for precise definition). The bundle E is also required to have a class of PS sections $\mathcal{A}$ which is rich near $Z(S)$ (Def.3.8) and S is k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}$ (Def.3.13). (X, E, S) is said to be **oriented** if the restriction of the determinant bundle $\det(S) \to Z(S)$ to the top strata $Z(S) \cap X_0$ is oriented.

IV. (X, E, S) is, roughly speaking, consisting of a PS Banach orbibundle $E \to X$ over a separable PS Banach orbifold X and a PS stratawise Fredholm section $S : X \to E$ with similar properties as in III.

Clearly, the Model IV includes the first three models as a special case. For each model we shall give a detailed discussions since their precise forms can be more suitable for different problems and we can get very refined results. For Model II and IV we shall adopt the method developed by Liu-Tian in [LiuT1]-[LiuT2]. The study of some properties is motivated by [Lu2]-[Lu3]. Related works were done by Hofer et al in the language of polyfolds [Ho], by Cieliebak-Mundet i Riera-Salamon for an oriented G-equivariant Fredholm section of a Hilbert space bundle over a Hilbert manifold [CMSa][1],and by McDuff in the language of groupoids [Mc3]. In [Mc3], McDuff proposed an intrinsic definition of a weighted branched manifold and used it to construct the virtual moduli cycle in a finite dimensional setting. She also adapted the method of Liu-Tian and expected to carry this construction to certain infinite dimensional setting which covers at least Gromov-Witten invariants. It will be interesting to compare the construction here to hers.

Section 1 will explain the constructions of the Euler classes of Banach Fredholm bundles though many of them are known. We here present them so that to have a good understanding and guide for other complex cases. The readers only need to skim over it. For a Banach Fredholm bundle (X, E, S) of index r as above, one can give it a small perturbation section σ so that the section $S + \sigma$ is still a Fredholm one with index r and is transversal to the zero section. Then $Z(S+\sigma)$ is a compact manifold of dimension r and is called a **Euler chain** of (X, E, S). If $Z(S+\sigma)$ has no part of codimension one then it is a cycle in X of dimension r, determines a homology class in $H_r(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ (resp. $H_r(X, \mathbb{Z})$ if S is orientable), denoted by $e(E, S)$ and called a **Euler cycle** of (X, E, S). In this case its homology is independent of such a generic small perturbation section σ, called a **Euler class** of the triple (X, E, S). This classical result and properties of Euler classes have a very important position in the global analysis, geometry and topology.

---

[1] Here G is a compact oriented Lie group such that the isotropy group of G at each point of the zero locus is finite

In the second section we shall consider the case of the Model II. That is, for Banach Fredholm orbibundles we develop a corresponding construction theory with Section 1. However, it is not hard to see that the usual arguments for Banach Fredholm bundles cannot be directly applied to the Banach Fredholm orbibundle (X, E, S) though one can prove that the zero set $Z(S)$ is still an orbifold when S is transversal to the zero section. In most cases, S is not transversal to the zero section, moreover, one cannot add an arbitrarily small section σ to S to get a section $S+\sigma$ which is transversal to the zero section. For example, let $\widetilde{X}$ be a closed smooth manifold of finite dimension, and Γ a finite group which has not only an automorphism representation on $\widetilde{X}$ but also a linear one on $\mathbb{R}^k$. Assume that γ acts on $\widetilde{X}$ effectively. Denote by $X = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$. Then the natural projection $p : E = (\widetilde{X} \times \mathbb{R}^k)/\Gamma \to \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$ is an orbibundle of rank k over orbifold $X = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$. A smooth section S of p may be identified with an equivariant smooth section $\tilde{S} : \widetilde{X} \to \widetilde{X} \times \mathbb{R}^k$, i.e. $\tilde{S}(g \cdot x) = g \cdot \tilde{S}(x)$ for any $x \in \widetilde{X}$ and $g \in \Gamma$. If such a section $\tilde{S} : \tilde{S} : \widetilde{X} \to \widetilde{X} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is not transversal to the zero section it follows from Theorem 1.5(B) that there exists a sufficiently small section $\tilde{\sigma} : \widetilde{X} \to \widetilde{X} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $\tilde{S} + \tilde{\sigma}$ is transversal to the zero section. But we can not guarantee that the section $\tilde{\sigma}$ and thus $\tilde{S} + \tilde{\sigma}$ is equivariant. So $\tilde{S} + \tilde{\sigma}$ can not descend to a single value section of the orbibundle $E \to X$ in general. So to deal with the Banach Fredholm bundles one needs to develop new methods. See [FuO], [LiT], [LiuT1]-[LiuT3], [R2] and [Sie] for some previous works. These works concern the important case of Gromov-Witten invariants. We are more interested in constructing virtual classes in the most general cases. More precisely, **for an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle** (X, E, S) **with compact zero locus, if** X **satisfies Assumption 2.45, i.e., each** $x \in X^{sing} \cap Z(S)$ **has the singularity of codimension at least two, we shall construct its (virtual rational) Euler class.** These will be completed in Sections 2.3-2.8 after we give an overall strategy in a special case in Section 2.2.

§3 deals with the case of the Model III. We abstract two essential notions in Definition 3.10 and Definition 3.12 and use them to develop the corresponding theory with §1.

Finally, in §4 we combine the methods in §2 and §3 to construct the virtual Euler chains and classes for the PS Banach Fredholm orbibundles in the Model IV, and study their properties. Our settings are motivated by constructing the Floer homology and Gromov-Witten invariants on general symplectic manifolds, but more general. We firstly discuss the general constructions, and then divide into two concrete frameworks. One of them, Framework I, is designed for the closed string Gromov-Witten invariants, under the Assumption 4.7 we construct the virtual Euler chains and classes and also get all corresponding results with those in §2. Framework II is designed for the Floer homology and the open string Gromov-Witten invariants, Theorem 4.20 is enough for the Floer homology. In actual applications to them the goodness conditions relative to $\mathcal{A}$ can be checked by the gluing arguments. Our attention is how to complete global constructions under the least local assumptions.

In this paper we shall **always assume**: our Banach manifolds (resp. orbifolds) are separable if we need to use Sard-Smale theorem, and admit smooth cut-off functions if we need them (for example, Hilbert manifolds (resp. orbifolds) and those Banach manifolds (resp. orbifolds) modelled and Sobolev spaces L^p_k with p an even integer).

A guide for the reader. The second section is the core of this paper. In that section, we explain ideas and methods of overcoming the difficulties of orbifolds in our construction in details as much as possible. In particular, the reader should be able to get a clear overall strategy for the construction. Having a good understanding of Section 2, one can easily understand Section 4 in which the related constructions are presented in a more general category including one for GW-invariants and Floer homologies.

Acknowledgements. The first author would like to thank the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics and the Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques for their hospitality and financial support where much of the work was done. We also warmly thank the referee for chasing an uncountable number of mistakes, and suggesting many improvements.

1 The Euler cycle of Banach Fredholm bundles

We first construct the Euler class of a Banach Fredholm bundle with compact zero locus, and then give two localization formulas and some properties. They are useful for us constructing and understanding the virtual Euler chain (or class). The basic references of our arguments are [AS], [Bru], §4.3 in [DoKr], [LiT] and [R]. We here adopt a way that is closely related to our generalization in the following sections though the method appears to be more complex.

1.1 The construction of the Euler cycles

Let $p : E \to X$ be a Banach vector bundle over a Banach manifold X with corners, and $S : X \to E$ be a C^1-smooth section with **zero locus** $Z(S) := \{x \in X \,|\, S(x) = 0\}$. If $Z(S) \neq \emptyset$, for each $x \in Z(S)$ let $DS(x) : T_xX \to E_x$

is the composition of the projection $\Pi(x) : T_{(x,0)}E \to E_x$ and the differential $dS(x) : T_xX \to T_{(x,0)}E$. We call $DS(x)$ the **vertical differential** of S at x. Using a connection ∇ on E (which in general may not exist on a Banach bundle) we can extend DS from $Z(S)$ to M by ∇S. In the literature one often meets the following two definitions of the Fredholm section of index r.

- For each $x \in Z(S)$, $DS(x) : T_xX \to E_x$ is a Fredholm operator of index r.
- In each local trivialization S may be represented by a Fredholm map of index r from the base to the fibre. (cf. page 137 in [DoKr].)

Clearly, the second definition seems to be stronger than the first one, and is always well-defined whether $Z(S) \neq \emptyset$ or not. Later we say the section satisfying the second definition to be **strongly Fredholm**. It is not hard to see that a strongly Fredholm section is stable under a small perturbation near a compact subset. The following result shows that these two definitions have no essential differences in the most cases.

Lemma 1.1 *Let $p : E \to X$ be any Banach bundle over a Banach manifold X with corners, and $S : X \to E$ be a Fredholm section. If the zero locus $Z(S)$ is nonempty then there exists an open neighborhood $U(Z(S))$ of $Z(S)$ such that the restrictions $S|_{U(Z(S))}$ is strongly Fredholm.*

Proof. For $x \in Z(S)$ let O_x be an open neighborhood of x in X and

$$\psi : O_x \times H \to E|_{O_x},\ (y, \xi) \mapsto \psi_y(\xi)$$

be a local trivialization. Here $\psi_y : H \to E_y$ is the topological linear isomorphism from a Banach space H to E_y. Then $\psi^{-1} \circ (S|_{O_x}) : O_x \to O_x \times H$ may be written as the form $\psi^{-1} \circ (S|_{O_x})(y) = (y, S_\psi(z))\, \forall y \in O_x$, where

$$S_\psi : O_x \to H,\ y \mapsto \psi_y^{-1}(S(y))$$

is called the **local representation** of S under the trivialization ψ, or a local representation of S near x. For $x \in Z(S)$ one easily proves that $DS(x)$ is Fredholm if and only if the differential $dS_\psi(x) : T_xX \to H$ is Fredholm for some (and thus any) local representative S_ψ of S near x. Since the Fredholmness of bounded linear operators between Banach spaces is stable under small perturbations we may assume that the differential $dS_\psi(y) : T_yX \to H$ is also Fredholm and has the same index as $dS_\psi(x)$ for each $y \in O_x$ by shrinking O_x if necessary. Setting $U(Z(s)) = \cup_{x \in Z(S)} O_x$ it is easy to see that the restriction of S to $U(Z(S))$ is strongly Fredholm. Lemma 1.1 is proved. □

Assume that $p : E \to X$ is a Hilbert vector bundle over a Hilbert manifold. Since the tangent space of a fibre E_x at any point $\xi \in E_x$ may be identified with E_x, using the orthogonal projection from $T_\xi E$ to E_x, denoted by $\mathbf{P}_\xi$, we have a "connection" D defined by

$$DS(x) := \mathbf{P}_{S(x)} \circ dS(x) : T_xX \to E_x. \tag{1.1}$$

It is still called the **vertical differential** of S at x without occurrence of confusions. Here we put the word connection between quotation marks because the projection $\mathbf{P}_\xi$ can **only depend on** ξ **continuously** if both the rank of E and the dimension of X are infinite. So we can only know that $DS(x)$ **is continuous in** x even if S is smooth. However, it is easily checked that for any local representative S_ψ, $DS(x)$ and $dS_\psi(x)$ have the same linear functional analysis properties. For example, $DS(x)$ is Fredholm (resp. onto) if and only if $dS_\psi(x)$ is Fredholm (resp. onto) and have the same index. These are sufficient for our many arguments.

A Fredholm section $S : X \to E$ is called **orientable** if the real (determinant) line bundle det(Ind(DS)) is trivial over $Z(S)$, i.e., it admits a continuous nowhere zero section on $Z(S)$. Clearly, such a given section determines an orientation of S. In this case we say the Banach Fredholm bundle (X, E, S) to be **oriented**.

The following two lemmas are elementary functional analysis exercises.

Lemma 1.2 *Let both A and B be two continuous linear operators from Banach spaces Y to Z. Suppose that A is onto. Then there exists a $\epsilon > 0$ such that B is also onto as $\|A - B\| < \epsilon$.*

Lemma 1.3 *Let X, Y and Z be Banach spaces, and both $A : X \to Z$ and $B : Y \to Z$ be continuous linear operators. Define*

$$A \oplus B : X \times Y \to Z,\ (x, y) \mapsto Ax + By.$$

(i) *If A is Fredholm and $A \oplus B$ is onto, then the restriction of the natural projection $X \times Y \to Y$ to* $\mathrm{Ker}(A \oplus B)$, $\Pi : \mathrm{Ker}(A \oplus B) \to Y$ *is a Fredholm operator with* $\mathrm{Index}(\Pi) = \mathrm{Index}(A)$*;*
(ii) *If* $\dim Y < +\infty$ *then $A \oplus B$ is Fredholm if and only if A is Fredholm, and in this case* $\mathrm{Index}(A \oplus B) = \mathrm{Index}(A) + \dim Y$.

Proof. We only prove (ii). Since $\dim Y < +\infty$ we have a direct sum decomposition $Y = Y_0 \oplus Y_1$, where $Y_0 = \mathrm{Ker}(B)$. Then $B|_{Y_1} : Y_1 \to Z$ is an injection. Set $Y_{10} = (B|_{Y_1})^{-1}(\mathrm{Im}(A))$ and decompose Y_1 into $Y_{10} \oplus Y_{11}$. Then $B|_{Y_1}(Y_{11}) \cap \mathrm{Im}(A) = \{0\}$ and $\mathrm{Im}(A \oplus B) = \mathrm{Im}(A) \oplus B|_{Y_1}(Y_{11})$. This and $\mathrm{Ker}(A) \subset \mathrm{Ker}(A \oplus B)$ imply that A is Fredholm if $A \oplus B$ is so. Conversely, if A is Fredholm we can decompose $X = X_0 \oplus X_1$, where $X_0 = \mathrm{Ker}(A)$. So

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ker}(A \oplus B) &= (\mathrm{Ker}(A) \times \{0\}) \oplus (\{0\} \times \mathrm{Ker}(B)) \\ &\quad \oplus \{(x, y) \in X_1 \times Y_{10} \mid A|_{X_1} x + B|_{Y_1} y = 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $A|_{X_1} : X_1 \to Y$ is injective and $B|_{Y_1}(Y_{10}) \subset \mathrm{Im}(A) = \mathrm{Im}(A|_{X_1})$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\dim \mathrm{Ker}(A \oplus B) &= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) + \dim \mathrm{Ker}(B) + \dim Y_{10} \\ &= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) + \dim \mathrm{Ker}(B) + \dim Y - \dim Y_{11} - \dim Y_0 \\ &= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) + \dim Y - \dim Y_{11}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\dim \mathrm{Ker}(A\oplus B) < +\infty$ and thus $A\oplus B$ is Fredholm (using $\mathrm{Im}(A\oplus B) = \mathrm{Im}(A) \oplus B|_{Y_1}(Y_{11})$ again). To get the final index equality we decompose $Z = \mathrm{Im}(A \oplus B) \oplus Z_2 = \mathrm{Im}(A) \oplus B|_{Y_1}(Y_{11}) \oplus Z_2$. Then $\mathrm{Coker}(A \oplus B) \cong Z_2$ and $\mathrm{Coker}(A) \cong B|_{Y_1}(Y_{11}) \oplus Z_2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Ind}(A \oplus B) &= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A \oplus B) - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A \oplus B) \\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) + \dim Y - \dim Y_{11} - \dim Z_2 \\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) + \dim Y - (\dim B|_{Y_1}(Y_{11}) + \dim Z_2) \\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) + \dim Y - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) \\
&= \mathrm{Index}(A) + \dim Y.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired result is proved. □

Let (X, E, S) be a Banach Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. By Lemma 1.1 we may assume that **the section $S : X \to E$ is strongly Fredholm**. For each $x \in Z(S)$ we can take a small open neighborhood O_x of x in X and a **local trivialization** $\psi^{(x)} : O_x \times E_x \to E|_{O_x}$. Let $S_{\psi^{(x)}} : O_x \to E_x$ be the corresponding trivialization representative of $S|_{O_x}$, i.e., it is defined by $\psi^{(x)}(y, S_{\psi^{(x)}}(y)) = S(y)\ \forall y \in O_x$. Then it is a Fredholm map. So there exist nonzero $v_{x1}, \cdots, v_{xk} \in E_x$, such that

$$dS_{\psi^{(x)}}(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_{1x}, \cdots, v_{xk}\}) = E_x.$$

By Lemma 1.2 we may shrink O_x and assume that

$$dS_{\psi^{(x)}}(y)(T_yX) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_{1x}, \cdots, v_{xk}\}) = E_x,\ \forall y \in O_x. \tag{1.2}$$

Take a smooth cut-off function $\beta_x : O_x \to [0, 1]$ such that it is equal to 1 near x. Denote by $O^0_x := \{y \in O_x \,|\, \beta_x(y) > 0\}$. (**This is where we need to require X having smooth cut-off functions**.) Then (2) implies that

$$dS_{\psi^{(x)}}(y)(T_yX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\beta_x(y) \cdot v_{1x}, \cdots, \beta_x(y) \cdot v_{xk}\}) = E_x \tag{1.3}$$

for any $y \in O^0_x$. For $i = 1, \cdots, k$, defining $\sigma_{xi} : X \to E$ by

$$\sigma_{xi}(y) = \begin{cases} \beta_x(y) \cdot \psi^{(x)}(y, v_{xi}) & \text{if } y \in O_x, \\ 0 & \text{if } y \notin O_x, \end{cases}$$

they have trivialization representatives $\beta_x \cdot v_{xi}$ under $\psi^{(x)}$, and

$$\mathrm{supp}(\sigma_{xi}) \subset Cl(O^0_x) \subset O_x,\ i = 1, \cdots, k.$$

It follows from (1.2) that for $y \in O^0_x \cap Z(S)$,

$$DS(y)(T_yX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_{x1}(y), \cdots, \sigma_{xk}(y)\}) = E_x. \tag{1.4}$$

Since $Z(S)$ is compact it can be covered by finitely many such open subsets O_{x_i}, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Setting $\mathcal{O}(Z(S)) = \cup^n_{i=1} O_{x_i}$ we easily get:

Lemma 1.4 *There exist an open neighborhood* $\mathcal{O}(Z(S))$ *of* $Z(S)$ *in* X *and finitely many smooth sections* $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \cdots, \sigma_m$ *of the bundle* $E \to X$ *such that:*

(i) $DS(y)(T_yX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(y), \cdots, \sigma_m(y)\}) = E_y$ *for any* $y \in Z(S)$.

(ii) $\mathrm{supp}(\sigma_i) \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S))$ *for* $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$.

Let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Consider smooth sections

$$\Phi : X \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \Pi_1^* E,\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i(y), \tag{1.5}$$

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}} : X \to E,\ y \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i(y), \tag{1.6}$$

where Π_1 is the projection to the first factor of $X \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Lemma 1.4(ii) implies that

$$Z(S) \times \{0\} \subset \Phi^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S)) \times \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Theorem 1.5 *There exist an open neighborhood* $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S))$ *of* $Z(S)$ *and a small* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that:*

(A) *The zero locus of* Φ *in* $Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ *is compact. Consequently, for any given small open neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $Z(S)$ *there exists a* $\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon]$ *such that* $Cl(\mathcal{W}) \cap \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{U}$ *for any* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. *In particular, each set* $\mathcal{W} \cap \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ *is* compact *for* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *sufficiently small.*

(B) *The restriction of* Φ *to* $\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *is (strongly) Fredholm and also transversal to the zero section. So*

$$U_\varepsilon := \{(y, \mathbf{t}) \in \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \,|\, \Phi(y, \mathbf{t}) = 0\}$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $m + \mathrm{Ind}(S)$, *and for* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *the section* $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}} : X \to E$ *is transversal to the zero section if and only if* $\mathbf{t}$ *is a regular value of the (proper) projection*

$$P_\varepsilon : U_\varepsilon \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto \mathbf{t},$$

and $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{W} = P_\varepsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{t})$. *(Specially,* $\mathbf{t} = 0$ *is a regular value of* P_ε *if* S *is transversal to the zero section). Then the Sard theorem yields a residual subset* $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *such that:*

(B.1) *For each* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ *the section* $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}}$ *is a Fredholm section of index* $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ *and the set* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \approx (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \times \{\mathbf{t}\} = P_\varepsilon^{-1}(\mathbf{t})$ *is a compact smooth manifold of dimension* $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ *and all* k*-boundaries*

$$\partial^k (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) = (\partial^k X) \cap (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$$

for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. *Specially, if* $Z(S) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$ *one can shrink* $\varepsilon > 0$ *so that* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ *is a closed manifold for each* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$.

(B.2) *If the Banach Fredholm bundle* (X, E, S) *is* **oriented**, *i.e., the determinant bundle* $\det(DS) \to Z(S)$ *is given a nowhere vanishing continuous section over* $Z(S)$, *then it determines an orientation on* U_ε. *In particular, it induces a natural orientation on every* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ *for* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$.

(B.3) *For any* $l \in \mathbb{N}$ *and two different* $\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ *the smooth manifolds* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ *and* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{(2)}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ *are cobordant in the sense that for a generic* C^l*-path* $\gamma : [0,1] \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *with* $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}^{(1)}$ *and* $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{t}^{(2)}$ *the set*

$$\Phi^{-1}(\gamma) := \cup_{t \in [0,1]} \{t\} \times (\Phi_{\gamma(t)}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$$

is a compact smooth manifold with boundary

$$\{0\} \times (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cup (-\{1\} \times (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{(2)}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)).$$

In particular, if $Z(S) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$ *and* $\varepsilon > 0$ *is suitably shrunk so that* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$ *for any* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *then* $\Phi^{-1}(\gamma)$ *has no corners.*

(B.4) *The cobordism class of the manifold* $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ *above is independent of all related choices.*

When a smooth map $f : M \to N$ is transversal to a submanifold $S \subset N$, the inverse image $f^{-1}(S)$ is either a manifold or an empty set. In this paper we always follow the usual **convention**: not mentioning the second case.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. The direct computation shows that the vertical differential

$$D\Phi(y, 0) : T_{(y,0)}(X \times \mathbb{R}^m) \to (\Pi_1^* E)_{(y,0)} = E_y \tag{1.7}$$

of Φ at any point $(y, 0) \in Z(S) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is given by

$$D\Phi(y, 0)(\xi, \mathrm{u}) = DS(y)(\xi) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} u_k \cdot \sigma_k(y)$$

for $\xi \in T_y X$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. By Lemma 1.4(i), the linear continuous operator $D\Phi(y, 0)$ is surjective for each $(y, 0) \in Z(S) \times \{0\} \subset \Phi^{-1}(0)$. Lemma 1.3(ii) also implies that $D\Phi(y, 0)$ is a Fredholm operator of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S) + m$. From the compactness of the subset $Z(S) \times \{0\} \subset X \times \mathbb{R}^m$ and Lemma 1.1 it follows that in some open neighborhood of $Z(S) \times \{0\}$ the section Φ is (strongly) Fredholm and also transversal to the zero section. Using the properness of the Fredholm map again we may derive that there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S))$ of $Z(S)$ and a small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

- The restriction of Φ to $\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a (strongly) Fredholm section of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S) + m$ and is also transversal to the zero section.
- The zero locus of Φ in $Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ is compact.

Step 1. Let us prove that the first claim in Theorem 1.5(A) implies others. Suppose that there exist a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in $\mathcal{W}$ and a sequence of zero points $\{(y_i, \mathbf{t}^{(i)})\}$ of Φ in $\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that $\mathbf{t}^{(i)} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$ and $y_i \notin \mathcal{U}$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. Since $\Phi^{-1}(0) \cap Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ is compact there exists a subsequence of $\{y_i\}$, still denoted by $\{y_i\}$, converging to some $y_0 \in Cl(\mathcal{W})$. So $\Phi(y_0, 0) = 0$ or $S(y_0) = 0$. That is, $y_0 \in Z(S)$. This implies that $y_i \in \mathcal{U}$ for very large i, which leads to a contradiction. Next we prove the second claim. Take a neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ in $\mathcal{W}$ such that $Cl(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{W}$. By the first claim, after shrinking $\varepsilon > 0$ we get that $Cl(\mathcal{W}) \cap \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{V}$ for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. For any sequence $\{y_k\} \subset \mathcal{W} \cap \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$, as above we can derive from the first claim that $\{y_k\}$ has a subsequence $\{y_{k_i}\}$ converging to $y_0 \in Cl(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{W}$. Specially, $\Phi(y_0, \mathbf{t}) = 0$. Therefore $y_0 \in \mathcal{W} \cap \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$. The desired conclusion is proved.

We only need to prove (B.2), (B.3) and (B.4) since other claims in Theorem 1.5(B) are clear. (In fact, the claim above Step 1 implies that U_ε is a smooth manifold of dimension $m + \mathrm{Ind}(S)$. So the projection P_ε has Fredholm index $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$. Then the first claim in (B.1) follows from the fact that the kernel $\mathrm{Ker}(D\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}(x)) = \mathrm{Ker}(DP_\varepsilon(x))$ has dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ and $\dim \mathrm{Coker}(D\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}(x)) = \dim \mathrm{Coker}(DP_\varepsilon(x)) = 0$ for any $x \in \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{W}$.) The following proofs are in three steps.

Step 2. In order to prove (B.2) let us consider the homotopy sections

$$\Psi^t : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^* E,\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + t \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i(y)$$

for $0 \le t \le 1$. By shrinking $\varepsilon > 0$ we can assume that they are all Fredholm and thus have the same index as Φ. By the construction of U_ε above,

$$T_{(y,\mathbf{t})} U_\varepsilon = \mathrm{Ker}(D\Phi)(y, \mathbf{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Coker}(D\Phi)(y, \mathbf{t})) = \{0\}.$$

So an orientation of U_ε is equivalent to giving a continuous nowhere zero section of $\det(D\Phi)$. Note that $Z(S) \times \{0\} \subset (\Psi^t)^{-1}(0)$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(D\Phi)|_{Z(S)\times\{0\}} &= \det(D\Psi^1)|_{Z(S)\times\{0\}} \\ &= \det(D\Psi^0)|_{Z(S)\times\{0\}} \\ &= (\det(DS) \otimes \det(\mathbb{R}^m))|_{Z(S)\times\{0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $o(S)$ be the given continuous nowhere zero section of $\det(DS)|_{Z(S)}$. Then $o(S) \otimes \mathbf{1}$ is such an section of $(\det(DS) \otimes \det(\mathbb{R}^m))|_{Z(S)\times\{0\}}$ and thus gives that of $\det(D\Phi)|_{Z(S)\times\{0\}}$.

Since E is local trivial, so is $\det(D\Phi)|_{U_\varepsilon}$. It follows that the nowhere zero section $o(S) \otimes \mathbf{1}$ may be extended into a continuous nowhere zero section of $\det(D\Phi)|_{U_\varepsilon}$. The latter naturally restricts to such a section of $\det(D\Phi_{\mathbf{t}})$ on $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$.

Step 3. Now let us to prove (B.3). Let $\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)})$ denote the space of all C^l-smooth paths $\gamma : [0, 1] \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}^{(1)}$ and $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{t}^{(2)}$.

Consider the section

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{W}\times[0,1]\times\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)}) &\to \Pi_1^*E,\\ (x,\tau,\gamma)&\mapsto S(x)+\sum_{i=1}^m\gamma_i(\tau)\sigma_i(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi_1 : \mathcal{W}\times[0,1]\times\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)}) \to \mathcal{W}$ is the projection and $\gamma = (\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_m)\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)})$. The (vertical) differential of $\mathcal{F}$ at any zero (x,τ,γ) of it is given by

$$\begin{aligned}D\mathcal{F}(x,\tau,\gamma): T_xX\times\mathbb{R}\times T_\gamma\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)}) &\to E_x,\\ (\xi,e,\alpha)&\to D\Phi(x,\gamma(\tau))(\xi,\alpha(\tau)+e\dot\gamma(\tau)).\end{aligned}$$

For $\tau=0$ and $\tau=1$ it is surjective as a function of ξ alone since the sections $\mathcal{F}(\cdot,0,\gamma)=\Phi^{(1)}_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\cdot,\tau,\gamma)=\Phi^{(2)}_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}}$ are transversal to the zero section. For $\tau\in[0,1]\setminus\{0,1\}$ we can choose $\alpha(\tau)$ arbitrarily and thus derive that this operator is also surjective as a function of ξ and α. Hence $\mathcal{F}$ is transversal to the zero section. Let P be the projection from $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(0)$ to the third factor. For $(x,\tau,\gamma)\in\mathcal{F}^{-1}(0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{(x,\tau,\gamma)}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(0)=\mathrm{Ker}(D\mathcal{F}(x,\tau,\gamma))\\ &=\{(\xi,e,\alpha)\in T_xX\times\mathbb{R}\times T_\gamma\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)})\mid\\ &\qquad\qquad D\Phi(x,\gamma(\tau))(\xi,\alpha(\tau)+e\dot\gamma(\tau))=0\}.\end{aligned}$$

So $(\xi,e,\alpha)\in\mathrm{Ker}(DP(x,\tau,\gamma))$ if and only if $\alpha=0$ and

$$D\Phi(x,\gamma(\tau))(\xi,e\dot\gamma(\tau))=0.$$

Note that $0=\mathcal{F}(x,\tau,\gamma)=\Phi(x,\gamma(\tau))$. This means that $(\xi,e\dot\gamma(\tau))\in T_{(x,\gamma(\tau))}U_\varepsilon$. It follows that $\dim\mathrm{Ker}(DP(x,\tau,\gamma))=\mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$. Hence P is a Fredholm operator of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$. One also easily prove that $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)})$ is a regular value of P if and only if the section

$$\mathcal{F}_\gamma:\mathcal{W}\times[0,1]\to\Pi_1^*E,(x,\tau)\mapsto S(x)+\sum_{i=1}^m\gamma_i(\tau)\sigma_i(x),$$

is transversal to the zero section. (This also implies $\mathcal{F}_\gamma$ to be a Fredholm section of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$.) Hence the Sard-Smale theorem yields a residual subset $\mathcal{P}^l_{reg}(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)})\subset\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)})$ such that each $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l_{reg}(\mathbf{t}^{(1)},\mathbf{t}^{(2)})$ gives a compact cobordsim $P^{-1}(\gamma)=\mathcal{F}_\gamma^{-1}(0)$ between $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{(2)}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$. The second claim easily follows from the second one in (B.1). (B.3) is proved.

Step 4. Finally we prove (B.4). As above assume that $\varepsilon'>0$, an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}'$ of $Z(S)$ and another group of sections of E, $\sigma'_1,\cdots,\sigma'_{m'}$ such that the section

$$\Psi:\mathcal{W}'\times B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})\to\Pi_1^*E,\ (y,\mathbf{t}')\mapsto S(y)+\sum_{i=1}^{m'}t'_i\sigma'_i(y),\qquad(1.8)$$

is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section and that the set $\Psi_{\mathbf{t}'}^{-1}(0)$ is compact for each $\mathbf{t}' \in B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$. Here the section $\Psi_{\mathbf{t}'}: \mathcal{W}' \to E$ is given by $\Psi_{\mathbf{t}'}(y) = \Psi(y, \mathbf{t}')$. Let $B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res} \subset B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ be the corresponding residual subset such that for each $\mathbf{t}' \in B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$ the section $\Psi_{\mathbf{t}'}$ is transversal to the zero section and that any two $\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{s}' \in B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$ yield cobordant manifolds $(\Psi_{\mathbf{t}'})^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Psi_{\mathbf{s}'})^{-1}(0)$.

For $0 < \eta < \min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}$ let us consider the section

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta: \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}' \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'}) \times [0,1] \to \Pi_1^* E, \\ (y, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}', \tau) \mapsto S(y) + (1-\tau)\sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i(y) + \tau \sum_{j=1}^{m'} t'_j \sigma_j^*(y). \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

Then $Z(S) \times \{0\} \times \{0\} \times [0,1] \subset \Theta^{-1}(0)$ and the vertical differential

$$D\Theta(y, 0, 0, \tau): T_y X \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m'} \times \mathbb{R} \to E_y$$

is Fredholm and surjective for any $(y, 0, 0, \tau) \in Z(S) \times \{0\} \times \{0\} \times [0,1]$. The standard arguments lead to:

Claim 1.6 *There exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^* \subset \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}'$ of $Z(S)$ and a small $\eta > 0$ such that:*

(ii) *The set $\Theta^{-1}(0) \cap Cl(\mathcal{W}^* \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'}) \times [0,1])$ is compact. So for any given small open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ there exists a small $\epsilon \in (0, \eta]$ such that for any point $(y, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}', \tau)$ in $\Theta^{-1}(0) \cap Cl(\mathcal{W}^* \times B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'}) \times [0,1])$ one has $y \in \mathcal{V}$.*

(ii) *The restriction of Θ to $\mathcal{W}^* \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'}) \times [0,1]$ is transversal to the zero section. So there exists a residual subset $(B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'}))_{res} \subset B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ such that for any $(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \in (B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'}))_{res}$ the section*

$$\Theta_{(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')}: \mathcal{W}^* \times [0,1] \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}^*}),\ (y, \tau) \mapsto \Theta(y, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}', \tau)$$

is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section, and thus $\Theta_{(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')}^{-1}(0)$ is a compact manifold of dimension $r+1$ and with boundary (and corners).

To finish the final proof we also need the following lemma.

Lemma 1.7 *[LeO] Let X and Y be metric spaces which satisfy the second axiom of countability. Suppose that S is a countable intersection of open dense subsets in the product space $X \times Y$. Consider the space X_S consisting of those $x \in X$ such that $S \cap \{x\} \times Y$ is a countable intersection of open dense subsets in $\{x\} \times Y$. Then X_S is a countable intersection of open dense subsets in X.*

Take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ in X so that $Cl(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{W}^*$. By Claim 1.6 and Lemma 1.7 we may take

$$(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \in \big((B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^{m'}))_{res}\big) \cap \big(B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \times B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}\big)$$

so small that $y\in\mathcal{V}$ for any $(y,\tau)\in\Theta^{-1}_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(0)$. Note that $\Theta(\cdot,\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}',0)=\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\Theta(\cdot,\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}',1)=\Psi(\cdot,\mathbf{t}')$. The manifold $\Theta^{-1}_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(0)$ forms a cobordsim between $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)\approx(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)\times\{0\}$ and $\Psi^{-1}_{\mathbf{t}'}(0)\approx\Psi^{-1}_{\mathbf{t}'}(0)\times\{1\}$, i.e. $\partial\Theta^{-1}_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(0)=(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)\times\{0\}\cup(-\Psi^{-1}_{\mathbf{t}'}(0)\times\{1\})$. If (X,E,S) is oriented then it is also oriented cobordsim. From this and (B.2) it follows that for any $\mathbf{t}\in B^{reg}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $\mathbf{t}'\in B^{reg}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ the corresponding manifolds $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ and $\Psi^{-1}_{\mathbf{t}'}(0)$ are cobordism. In summary we have shown that the cobordant class of the manifold $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ is independent of all related choices. Theorem 1.5 is proved. □

Each $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ is called the **Euler chain** of (X,E,S). If it has no boundary $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ is a cycle, called the **Euler cycle** of (X,E,S). In this case the homology class $[(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)]$ in $H_r(X,\mathbb{Z}_2)$ (resp. $H_r(X,\mathbb{Z})$ if (X,E,S) is oriented) is only dependent on (X,E,S), called the **Euler class** of it and denoted by $e(E,S)$.

Some authors, ex. [R1], [R2] and [CMSa], like to view $e(E,S)$ as a homomorphism $\mu_{(E,S)}$ from $H^*(X,\mathbb{R})$ to $\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mu_{(E,S)}(\alpha)=\langle\alpha,e(E,S)\rangle \text{ for } \alpha\in H^r(X,\mathbb{R}),$$

and $\mu_{(E,S)}(\alpha)=0$ for other α. Let $P_\varepsilon:U_\varepsilon\to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ be as in Theorem 1.5(B). Take a Thom form τ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ with support in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Then

$$\mu_{(E,S)}(\alpha)=\int_{U_\varepsilon}(R^*_\varepsilon\alpha)\wedge(P^*_\varepsilon\tau),$$

where R_ε is the composition of the projection $U_\varepsilon\to\mathcal{W}$ and the inclusion $\mathcal{W}\hookrightarrow X$, and we have used the same notation $R^*_\varepsilon\alpha$ to denote its closed form representative. This sometimes is convenient.

Remark 1.8 By the arguments in lemma 1.4 we may require that at least one of $\sigma_1(z)$, $\sigma_2(z),\cdots,\sigma_m(z)$ be nonzero at each point $z\in Z(S)$ even if $DS(y)(T_yX)=E_y$ for some $y\in Z(S)$. In this case the linear map

$$L_x:\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathrm{Span}(\{\sigma_1(x),\cdots,\sigma_m(x)\}),\ \mathbf{t}\mapsto\sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(x).$$

is nonzero for any $x\in Z(S)$. So the subspace $\mathrm{Ker}(L_x)\subset\mathbb{R}^m$ has at least codimension one. Denote by S^m the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Take a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ of $S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ in S^m. Then $L_x(\mathbf{t})\neq0$ for any $\mathbf{t}\in S^m\setminus\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$. Note that $S^m\setminus\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ is a compact subset in S^m. By a contradiction arguments one easily shows that there exists a small open neighborhood O_x of x in X such that $L_z(\mathbf{t})=\sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(z)\neq0$ for any $z\in O_x$. Let $\angle\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ be the open cone spanned by $\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$. Then $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}\setminus\angle\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ is a residual subset in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\setminus\angle\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ and for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}\setminus\angle\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap\mathrm{Ker}(L_x))$ the manifold $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ satisfies

$$(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)\cap(O_x\cap Z(S))=\emptyset.$$

So for a given finite subset $F \subset Z(S)$ one can choose $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ so that $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cap F = \emptyset$.

Question. Is there $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ such that $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cap Z(S) = \emptyset$ or $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cap Z(S)$ is nowhere dense in $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$? (Some attempts: Using the compactness of $Z(S)$ we can find finitely many subspaces of codimension at least one in $\mathbb{R}^m$, saying $H_1, \cdots, H_r$, and a very thin open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}(\cup_{i=1}^r S^m \cap H_i)$ of $\cup_{i=1}^r S^m \cap H_i$ in S^m such that in some open neighborhood of $Z(S)$, $\sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(y) \neq 0$ for each $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ with $\mathbf{t}/|\mathbf{t}| \in \mathcal{U}(\cup_{i=1}^r S^m \cap H_i)$. Since we have assumed X to be a separable Banach manifold it possess a countable base. It follows that the compact subspace $Z(S)$ has a countable base and thus is also separable.)

Remark 1.9 Carefully checking the above construction one easily sees that for any compact subset $\Lambda \subset Z(S)$ (even if $Z(S)$ is not compact) we can find open neighborhoods $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{O}(\Lambda)$ of Λ, smooth sections σ_i with supports in $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda)$, $i = 1, \cdots, l$, and $\epsilon > 0$ such that:

(a) The section

$$\Phi^\Lambda : \mathcal{W}(\Lambda) \times B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l) \to \Pi_1^* E,\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} t_i\sigma_i(y)$$

is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section.

(b) The zero locus $(\Phi^\Lambda)^{-1}(0)$ has compact closure in $Cl(\mathcal{W}(\Lambda) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^l))$ and thus $(\Phi^\Lambda)^{-1}(0) \cap (\Lambda \times \{0\})$ is compact.

Then there exists a residual subset $B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res} \subset B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}$ the section

$$\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{W}(\Lambda) \to E,\ y \mapsto \Phi^\Lambda(y, \mathbf{t})$$

is transversal to the zero section and each intersection $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0) \cap \Lambda$ is compact. As before any two different $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}$ give smooth cobordant manifolds $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}'})^{-1}(0)$ in the sense that there exist generic paths $\gamma : [0,1] \to B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)$ with $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}$ and $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{t}'$ such that

$$(\Phi^\Lambda)^{-1}(\gamma) := \cup_{t \in [0,1]} \{t\} \times (\Phi^\Lambda_{\gamma(t)})^{-1}(0)$$

is a smooth manifold with boundary $\{0\} \times (\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0) \cup (-\{1\} \times (\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}'})^{-1}(0))$ which is relative compact in $[0,1] \times Cl(\mathcal{W}(\Lambda))$. Note also that each intersection $\Lambda \cap (\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ is compact since Λ is compact. Later each $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ is also called a **local Euler chain** of (X, E, S) near Λ. Moreover, for any given open neighborhood $U(\Lambda)$ of Λ in X we can shrink $\epsilon > 0$ so that each $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ is contained in $U(\Lambda)$ for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)$.

Remark 1.10 If $Z(S)$ is not compact we can extend Theorem 1.5 to the case that $Z(S)$ is σ-compact, i.e., it is the union of countable compact sets. In this case we can similarly define the **Euler class** of the triple (X, E, S) sitting in the homology of the second kind $H_r^{II}(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ (resp. $H_r^{II}(X, \mathbb{Z})$ if the real (determinant) line bundle det(Ind(DS)) is trivial over $Z(S)$).

1.2 Localization formula

In applications we often meet the following **model**: Let (X, E, S) be a Banach Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. Assume that it has the Euler class $e(E, S)$ as above. Let P be a manifold of finite dimension, and $f : X \to P$ be a smooth map. For $\alpha \in H^r(P, \mathbb{R})$ let α^* be a differential form representative of it. If $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ is a Euler cycle of (X, E, S) that is a closed manifold as above then

$$\langle f^*\alpha, e(E, S)\rangle = \langle \alpha, f_*e(E, S)\rangle = \int_{(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)} f^*\alpha^*. \tag{1.10}$$

Proposition 1.11 *(***First localization formula***). If α has a representative form α^* such that $f^*\alpha^*$ has support* $\mathrm{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)$ *contained in a compact subset $\Lambda \subset Z(S)$ then for the family $\{(\Phi^{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0) \,|\, \mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\}$ in Remark 1.9 there exists a residual subset $B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)^\star_{res} \subset B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}$ such that*

$$\langle e(E, S), f^*\alpha\rangle = \int_{(\Phi^{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)} f^*\alpha^*$$

for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)^\star_{res}$.

Proof. We always assume that $Z(S)$ is compact in the following proof. Assume that the family $\{(\Phi^{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0) \,|\, \mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\}$ is as in Remark 1.9. Fix a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0$ of Λ in $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$ so that

$$\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0 \subset\subset \mathcal{W}(\Lambda).$$

Hereafter we write $A \subset\subset B$ to mean that A has closure contained in B without special statements. Note that $Z(S) \setminus \mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$ is compact. We furthermore take finitely many points $x_i \in Z(S) \setminus \mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$ and their open neighborhoods O_i in X, $i = k+1, \cdots, n$, and smooth sections σ_j of E with supports in $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda)_2 := \cup_{i=k+1}^n O_i$, $j = l+1, \cdots, m$, satisfying

$$Z(S) \setminus \mathcal{W}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{O}(\Lambda)_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}(\Lambda)_2 \cap \mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0 = \emptyset.$$

As before one can find an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}(\Lambda) \cup \mathcal{O}(\Lambda)_2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \epsilon]$ such that:

(I) The section

$$\Phi : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*E,\ (y, \mathbf{s}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m s_i\sigma_i(y)$$

is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section.

(II) The zero set $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ has compact closure in $Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$.

Then one has a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that the section

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{s}} : \mathcal{W} \to \Pi_1^*E,\ y \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m s_i\sigma_i(y)$$

is transversal to the zero section for each $\mathbf{s}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$.

Let Π^m_l denote the projection from $\mathbb{R}^m$ onto the former l coordinates. By Lemma 1.7, $\Pi^m_l(B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res})$ is still a residual subset in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)$. So is the intersection

$$B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)^\star_{res} := B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\cap \Pi^m_l(B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}).$$

Note that for any $\mathbf{s}'=(s_1,\cdots,s_l)\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)^\star_{res}$ we can always choose $s_{l+1},\cdots,s_m$ in $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbf{s}=(s_1,\cdots,s_m)\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. For such $\mathbf{s}$ it is easily checked that $\Phi_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}(0)\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0$ agrees with $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{s}'})^{-1}(0)\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0$ because the sections σ_i, $i=l+1,\cdots,m$ have supports outside $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0$. It follows from $\mathrm{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)\subset\Lambda$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{s}'})^{-1}(0)} f^*\alpha^* &= \int_{(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{s}'})^{-1}(0)\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0} f^*\alpha^*\\ &= \int_{(\Phi_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1}(0)\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0} f^*\alpha^*\\ &= \int_{(\Phi_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1}(0)} f^*\alpha^*\\ &= \langle e(E,S), f^*\alpha\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The desired result is proved. □

If Λ is a connected component of $Z(S)$, it is also compact and we can require that the above small neighborhood $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$ of Λ is disjoint with $Z(S)\setminus\Lambda$. In this situation $\{(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)\,|\,\mathbf{t}\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\}$ is a family of cobordant cycles and thus determines a homology class in $H_r(X)$, denoted by $e(E,S)_\Lambda$. Let Λ_i, $i=1,\cdots,p$, be all connected components of Λ. Then

$$e(E,S)=\sum_{i=1}^p e(E,S)_{\Lambda_i}.$$

The second localization formula is as follows:

Proposition 1.12 (**Second localization formula**). *Let (X,E,S) be an oriented Banach Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. Suppose that a closed subset $Y\subset X$ is a Banach submanifold of finite positive codimension. Then $(Y,E|_Y,S|_Y)$ is still a Banach Fredholm bundle with a natural induced orientation and there exist the Euler chains M of (X,E,S) and N of $(Y,E|_Y,S|_Y)$ such that $M\cap Y=N$. Moreover, M and N can be chosen as closed manifolds if both $e(E,S)$ and $e(E|_Y,S|_Y)$ exist. In particular, if P is an oriented smooth manifold of finite dimension, $Q\subset P$ is an oriented closed submanifold and a smooth map $f:X\to P$ is transversal to Q, then for $Y:=f^{-1}(Q)\subset X$ (a Banach submanifold satisfying the above requirements!), when both $e(E,S)$ and $e(E|_Y,S|_Y)$ exist, it holds that*

$$I_{Q*}(a)\cdot_P f_*(e(E,S)) = a\cdot_Q f_*(e(E|_Y,S|_Y))$$

for any class $a\in H_*(Q,\mathbb{R})$ of codimension r. (This should imply that $f_*(e(E|_Y,S|_Y)=f_*(e(E,S))\cap PD(Q)$.) Here $I_Q:Q\to P$ is the inclusion map, $\cdot_P$ (resp. $\cdot_Q$) is the intersection product in P (resp. Q).

Proof. By Proposition C.1, the restriction of a bounded linear Fredholm operator to a closed subspace of finite codimension is also Fredholm. So from the fact that Y has finite codimension in X it easily follows that $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is also a Banach Fredholm bundle. As before we can take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in X, $\varepsilon > 0$ and smooth sections $\sigma_i : X \to E$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$, such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ both sections

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{W} \to E,\ y \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i\sigma_i(y),$$
$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^Y : \mathcal{W} \cap Y \to E|_Y,\ y \mapsto S|_Y(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i\sigma_i|_Y(y),$$

are transversal to the zero section. Note that $\mathcal{W} \cap Y$ is an open neighborhood of $Z(S|_Y) = Z(S) \cap Y$ in Y. Then $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cap Y = (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^Y)^{-1}(0)$ and thus $M = (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ and $N = (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^Y)^{-1}(0)$ are the desired Euler chains.

In particular, suppose that $Y = f^{-1}(Q)$ is as above. Let a_Q^* be a differential form representative of the Poincaré dual $a \in H_*(Q, \mathbb{R})$ and R_Q be a retraction from a tubular neighborhood of Q in P onto Q. If Q^* is a representative form of the Poincaré dual of Q in P whose support is contained in the above tubular neighborhood, then $a^* := R_Q^*(a_Q^*) \wedge Q^*$ is a representative form of the Poincaré dual of $a \in H_*(Q, \mathbb{R}) \subset H_*(P, \mathbb{R})$ in P. So

$$\begin{aligned}
a \cdot_Q f_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y)) &= \int_{f(N)} a_Q^* \\
&= \int_{f(M)\cap Q} a_Q^* \\
&= \int_{R_Q(f(M)\cap Q)} a_Q^* \\
&= \int_{f(M)\cap Q} R_Q^*(a_Q^*) \\
&= \int_{f(M)} R_Q^*(a_Q^*) \wedge Q^* \\
&= \int_{f(M)} a^* = a \cdot_P f_*(e(E, S)).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the fifth equality is obtained by jiggling $f|_M$ so that it is transversal to Q. The desired result is proved. □

1.3 Properties

Our first property is a stability result, which comes from Proposition 14 in [Bru]. But we here requires slightly strong assumptions because our proof actually give the relations of the corresponding Euler cycles.

Proposition 1.13 *(***Stablity***) Let (X, E, S) be a Banach Fredholm bundle of index r and with the Euler class $e(E, S)$. Assume that there exists a* *smooth direct sum decomposition of Banach bundles $E = E' \oplus E''$ over a neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$. Let $\mathrm{P}_{E'}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{E''}$ be the fibrewise projections onto E' and E'' respectively. For the natural sections*

$$S' = \mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ S : \mathcal{W} \to E'|_{\mathcal{W}} \quad \text{and} \quad S'' = \mathrm{P}_{E''} \circ S : \mathcal{W} \to E''|_{\mathcal{W}}$$

($Z(S) = Z(S') \cap Z(S'')$ and $Z(S) = Z(S'|_{Z(S'')})$ are clear), suppose that $DS''|_{Z(S)}$ is surjective, i.e. for any $x \in Z(S)$ the vertical differential $DS''(x) : T_xX \to E''_x$ is onto. Then

(a) *for some small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in X the intersection $Z(S'')^\star := Z(S'') \cap \mathcal{U}$ is a smooth manifold;*

(b) *$D(S'|_{Z(S'')}) : (TZ(S''))|_{Z(S)} \to E'|_{Z(S)}$ is a Fredholm bundle map of index $\mathrm{Ind}(D(S'|_{Z(S'')}) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS)$ and there exists a closed manifold representative N of $e(E'|_{Z(S'')^\star}, S'|_{Z(S'')^\star})$ and that M of $e(E, S)$ such that $M = N$. In particular it implies*

$$e(E, S) = (i_{Z(S'')^\star})_* e(E'|_{Z(S'')^\star}, S'|_{Z(S'')^\star}),$$

where $(i_{Z(S'')^\star})_*$ is the homomorphism between the homology groups induced by the inclusion $i_{Z(S'')^\star} : Z(S'')^\star \hookrightarrow X$.

Proof. The conclusion (a) is obvious. For $x \in Z(S) = Z(S') \cap Z(S'')$, it is easily checked that the linear Fredholm operator $DS(x) : T_xX \to E_x$ may be decomposed into $DS(x) = DS'(x) \oplus DS''(x) : T_xX \to E'_x \oplus E''$. So the induced operator $\widehat{DS(x)} : T_xX \to E_x/E'_x$ (as the composition of $DS(x)$ and the quotient map $E_x \to E_x/E'_x$) may be identified with $DS''(x)$ since we identify $E''_x \equiv E_x/E'_x$. Then we can identify $\mathrm{Ker}(\widehat{DS(x)})$ with $\mathrm{Ker}(DS''(x)) = (DS(x))^{-1}(E'_x)$ and the map

$$\widetilde{DS(x)} : \mathrm{Ker}(\widehat{DS(x)}) \to E'_x, \ v \mapsto DS(x)(v),$$

with one

$$D(S'|_{Z(S'')})(x) : T_xZ(S'') \to E'_x$$

because the surjectivity of $DS''(x)$ implies that $T_xZ(S'') = \mathrm{Ker}(DS''(x))$. By Proposition C.3 in Appendix C we get that $D(S'|_{Z(S'')})(x)$ is a Fredholm operator with index $\mathrm{Ind}(D(S'|_{Z(S'')})(x)) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS(x))$.

Next we prove the second claim in (b). Since $Z(S)$ is compact we may take finitely many points $x_1, \cdots, x_m$ in $Z(S)$ and their open neighborhoods O_j in X which can be required in $\mathcal{U}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$ such that $Z(S) \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S)) := \cup_{j=1}^m O_j$ and that there exist trivializations $\psi_j : O_j \times E_{x_j} \to E|_{O_j}$ so that for any $y \in O_j$ the maps $\psi_{jy} = \psi_j(y, \cdot) : E_y \to E_{x_j}$ preserve the splitting $E_y = E'_y \oplus E''_y \to E_{x_j} = E'_{x_j} \oplus E''_{x_j}$, i.e., $\psi_{jy}(E'_y) = E'_{x_j}$ and $\psi_{jy}(E''_y) = E''_{x_j}$. Let $S'_j : O_j \to E'_{x_j}$ (resp. $S''_j : O_j \to E''_{x_j}$) be trivialization representatives of $S'|_{O_j}$ (resp. $S''|_{O_j}$), i.e., $\psi_j(y, S'_j(y)) = S'(y)$ (resp. $\psi_j(y, S''_j(y)) = S''(y)$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Then $S_j := S'_j + S''_j$ are trivialization representatives of $S|_{O_j}$, i.e., $\psi_j(y, S_j(y)) = S(y)$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Note that $DS''|_{Z(S)}$ is surjective. As before we may choose finitely many sections $\sigma'_1, \cdots, \sigma'_k$ of E' such that their trivialization representatives under ψ_j,

$$\sigma'_{ij}, i = 1, \cdots, k,\ j = 1, \cdots, m,$$

satisfy:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} dS'_j(y)(T_y Z(S'')) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma'_{1j}(y), \cdots, \sigma'_{kj}(y)\} = E'_{x_j} \\ \quad \forall y \in Z(S'') \cap O_j,\ j = 1, \cdots, m, \end{array}\right\} \tag{1.11}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} dS_j(y)(T_y X) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma'_{1j}(y), \cdots, \sigma'_{kj}(y)\} = E_{x_j} \\ \quad \forall y \in O_j,\ j = 1, \cdots, m. \end{array}\right\} \tag{1.12}$$

For $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ consider the sections

$$\Phi'_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{O}(Z(S)) \to E'|_{\mathcal{O}(Z(S))}, \quad x \mapsto S'(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i \sigma'_i(x),$$

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{O}(Z(S)) \to E|_{\mathcal{O}(Z(S))}, \quad x \mapsto S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i \sigma'_i(x).$$

As before it follows from (1.11) and (1.12) that exist a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S))$ of $Z(S)$ in X and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for the open neighborhood $\mathcal{N} := \mathcal{O}(Z(S)) \cap \mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in $Z(S'')^\star$ and each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^k)_{res}$ the sections

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{W} \to E|_{\mathcal{W}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi'_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{N} \to E'|_{\mathcal{N}}$$

are all transversal to the zero section. Let $R_{\mathbf{t}} = \Phi'_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{N}}$. Note that

$$\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} = \Phi'_{\mathbf{t}},\ \ \mathrm{P}_{E''} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} = S'' \ \text{ and } \ \mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} + \mathrm{P}_{E''} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} = \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}. \tag{1.13}$$

We claim that for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^k)_{res}$ small enough,

$$(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) = R_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0). \tag{1.14}$$

Then the desired result follows from it.

To prove (1.14) note that $\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}(y) = S'(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma'_i(y) = R_{\mathbf{t}}(y)$ for $y \in Z(S'') \cap \mathcal{W}$. So $\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}(y) = 0$ for any $y \in R_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$. It follows from (1.13) that for any $y \in R_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \subset Z(S'') \cap \mathcal{W}$, $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}(y) = 0$ and thus

$$R_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \subset (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0).$$

On the other hand, (1.13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \ &\subset (\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cap (\mathrm{P}_{E''} \circ S)^{-1}(0) \\ &= (\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \cap Z(S''). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $R_{\mathbf{t}}$ we get $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \subset R_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ and thus (1.14). The desired result is proved. □

In the proof above it is important for us to assume that there exists a smooth direct sum decomposition of Banach bundles $E = E' \oplus E''$ over a neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$. As a consequence we get the following special case of Proposition 2.8 in [R1].

Corollary 1.14 *Let (X, E, S) be as in Proposition 1.13. Assume:*

(i) $\dim \mathrm{Coker} DS(y) = k$ *on* $Z(S)$*,* $Z(S)$ *is a closed smooth manifold of dimension* $r + k$ *and thus* $\mathrm{Coker} DS$ *forms an obstruction bundle* $\mathcal{E}$ *over* $Z(S)$*.*

(ii) *There exist an open neighborhood* $\mathcal{W}$ *of* $Z(S)$ *and a decomposition of the direct sum of Banach bundles*

$$E|_{\mathcal{W}} = F \oplus F^c$$

such that $F^c|_{Z(S)}$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathcal{E}$ *and that the Banach subbundle* F *of corank* k *restricts to* $\mathrm{Im}(DS)$ *on* $Z(S)$*, i.e.,* $F_y = \mathrm{Im}(DS(y))$ *for any* $y \in Z(S)$*.*

Then there exist closed manifold representatives M *of* $e(E, S)$ *and* N *of* $e(\mathcal{E})$ *such that* $M = N \cap Z(S)$*, and in particular* $e(E, S) = e(\mathcal{E}) \cap [Z(S)]$*.*

Proof. Note first that $e(F^c|_{Z(S)}) = e(\mathcal{E})$ because $F^c|_{Z(S)}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathrm{P}_F : E|_{\mathcal{W}} \to F$ and $\mathrm{P}_{F^c} : E|_{\mathcal{W}} \to F^c$ be clear bundle projections. By the assumption above, the section $\mathrm{P}_F \circ S : \mathcal{W} \to F$ is transversal to the zero section at each point $y \in Z(S)$. The desired conclusions follow from Proposition 1.13. □

Proposition 1.15 *(***Product***) For* $i = 1, 2$ *let* (X_i, E_i, S_i) *be Banach Fredholm bundles of index* r_i *and with compact zero locus* $Z(S_i)$*. Then the natural product* $(X_1 \times X_2, E_1 \times E_2, S_1 \times S_2)$ *is such a bundle of index* $r = r_1 + r_2$ *and with zero locus* $Z(S_1 \times S_2) = Z(S_1) \times Z(S_2)$ *and for* $i = 1, 2$ *there exist compact submanifolds* M_i *of* X_i*, which are the Euler chains of* (X_i, E_i, S_i)*, such that the product manifold* $M = M_1 \times M_2$ *is a Euler chain of* $(X_1 \times X_2, E_1 \times E_2, S_1 \times S_2)$*. If both* $e(E_1, S_1)$ *and* $e(E_2, S_2)$ *exist then* $e(E_1 \times E_2, S_1 \times S_2)$ *also exist and the compact manifolds* M_i *can be chosen to be without boundary.*

Proof. Let $S := S_1 \times S_2$. Then $S((x_1, x_2)) = (S_1(x_1), S_2(x_2))$ for $x = (x_1, x_2) \in X_1 \times X_2$. One easily checks that S is also a Fredholm section and $\mathrm{Ind}(S) = \mathrm{Ind}(S_1) + \mathrm{Ind}(S_2)$.

Let open neighborhoods $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{O}(Z(S))$ of $Z(S)$ in $X_1 \times X_2$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and the sections $\sigma_j = \sigma_j^{(1)} \times \sigma_j^{(2)} : X_1 \times X_2 \to E_1 \times E_2$ with supports in $\mathcal{O}(Z(S))$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$, be such that Theorem 1.5 holds for them. Let

$$\Phi^{(i)} : X_i \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^* E_i,\ x_i \mapsto S_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^m t_j \sigma_j^{(i)}(x_i).$$

Then $\Phi = \Phi_1^{(1)} \times \Phi_2^{(2)}$ and $Z(\Phi) = Z(\Phi^{(1)}) \times Z(\Phi^{(2)})$. For $i = 1, 2$ let us take open neighborhoods $\mathcal{W}_i$ of $Z(S_i)$ in X_i so that $\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2 \subset \mathcal{W}$. Note that for $x = (x_1, x_2) \in Z(\Phi)$ the vertical differential $D\Phi(x) : T_x(X_1 \times X_2) \to E_{1x_1} \times E_{2x_2}$ is onto if and only if both $D\Phi^{(1)}(x_1) : T_{x_1}X_1 \to E_{1x_1}$ and $D\Phi^{(2)}(x_2) : T_{x_2}X_2 \to E_{2x_2}$ are onto. By Theorem 1.5(A), by shrinking

$\varepsilon > 0$ we can assume that $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2$ for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. So for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the sections $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\Phi^{(i)}_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, are all transversal to the zero section. In particular we get

$$(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0) = (\Phi^{(1)}_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}_1})^{-1}(0) \times (\Phi^{(2)}_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}_2})^{-1}(0).$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 1.15. □

Two Banach Fredholm bundles $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$, of index r and with compact zero locus are called **homotopy** if there exists a Banach Fredholm bundle $(X \times [0, 1], E, S)$ of index $r + 1$ and with compact zero locus such that $E^{(i)} = E|_{\{i\}\times X}$ and $S^{(i)} = S|_{\{i\}\times X}$ for $i = 0, 1$. The homotopy is called an **oriented homotopy** if $(X \times [0, 1], E, S)$ and $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$, are also oriented and the orientation of $(X \times [0, 1], E, S)$ induces those of $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$.

Proposition 1.16 *(***Homotopy***) If two (oriented) Banach Fredholm bundles $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$, of index r and with compact zero locus are (oriented) homotopic, then they have the same Euler class.*

Proof. By the arguments before Theorem 1.5 we may choose points

$$\begin{aligned}&(x_{0i}, 0) \in Z(S),\ i = 1, \cdots, m_0,\\ &(x_{1i}, 1) \in Z(S),\ i = 1, \cdots, m_1,\\ &(y_j, t_j) \in Z(S) \cap (X \times (0, 1)), j = 1, \cdots, m_2\end{aligned}$$

and their open neighborhoods in $X \times [0, 1]$, O_{0i}, $i = 1, \cdots, m_0$, O_{1i}, $i = 1, \cdots, m_1$ and O_j, $j = 1, \cdots, m_2$, and smooth sections s_{0i}, $i = 1, \cdots, n_0$, s_{1i}, $i = 1, \cdots, n_1$, s_j, $j = 1, \cdots, n_2$ such that:

(i) $Z(S) \subset (\cup_{i=1}^{m_0} O_{0i}) \cup (\cup_{k=1}^{m_1} O_{1k}) \cup (\cup_{j=1}^{m_2} O_j)$,

(ii) $Z(S^{(0)}) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{m_0} O_{0i} \cap (X \times \{0\})$,

(ii) $Z(S^{(1)}) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{m_1} O_{1i} \cap (X \times \{1\})$,

(iii) each O_j is contained in $X \times (0, 1)$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_2$,

(iv) the support of each s_{0i} (resp. s_{1i}, s_j) is contained in some O_{0k} (resp. O_{1l}, O_s),

(v) $\mathrm{span}\{s_{01}(p), \cdots, s_{0n_0}(p), s_{11}(p), \cdots, s_{1n_1}(p), s_1(p), \cdots, s_{n_2}(p)\} + \mathrm{Im}(DS(p)) = E_p$ for any $p \in Z(S)$,

(vi) $\mathrm{span}\{s_{01}(x), \cdots, s_{0n_0}(x)\} + \mathrm{Im}(DS^{(0)}(x)) = E^{(0)}_x$ for any $x \in Z(S^{(0)})$,

(vii) $\mathrm{span}\{s_{11}(x), \cdots, s_{1n_1}(x)\} + \mathrm{Im}(DS^{(1)}(x)) = E^{(1)}_x$ for any $x \in Z(S^{(1)})$.

It follows that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, the residual subsets $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_0})_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_0})$, $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_1})_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_1})$, $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^n)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $n = n_0 + n_1 + n_2$, and a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in $X \times [0, 1]$ such that for any

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{t}^0 = (t_{01}, \cdots, t_{0n_0}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_0})_{res},\\ &\mathbf{t}^1 = (t_{11}, \cdots, t_{1n_1}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_1})_{res},\\ &\mathbf{r} = (r_{01}, \cdots, r_{0n_0}, r_{11}, \cdots, r_{1n_1}, r_1, \cdots, r_{n_2}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^n)_{res},\end{aligned}$$

the sections

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{r}} : \mathcal{W} \to E|_{\mathcal{W}},\ p \mapsto S(p) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} r_{0i}s_{0i}(p) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} r_{1k}s_{1k}(p) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} r_j s_j(p),$$

$$\Phi^{(0)}_{\mathbf{t}^0} : \mathcal{W}^0 = \mathcal{W} \cap (X \times \{0\}) \to E^{(0)}|_{\mathcal{W}^0},\ x \mapsto S^{(0)}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} t_{0i}s_{0i}(x),$$

$$\Phi^{(1)}_{\mathbf{t}^1} : \mathcal{W}^1 = \mathcal{W} \cap (X \times \{1\}) \to E^{(1)}|_{\mathcal{W}^1},\ x \mapsto S^{(1)}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} t_{1k}s_{1k}(x)$$

are all transversal to the zero section. By Lemma 1.7 we can take $\mathbf{r}^0 = (r_{01}, \cdots, r_{0n_0}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_0})_{res}$, $\mathbf{r}^1 = (r_{11}, \cdots, r_{1n_1}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{n_1})_{res}$ such that $\mathbf{r} = (\mathbf{r}^0, \mathbf{r}^1, r_1, \cdots, r_{n_2}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^n)_{res}$ some $r_1, \cdots, r_{n_2} \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for this $\mathbf{r}$ it is easily checked that

$$\partial(\Phi_{\mathbf{r}})^{-1}(0) = (\Phi^{(0)}_{\mathbf{r}^0})^{-1}(0) \cup (-(\Phi^{(1)}_{\mathbf{r}^1})^{-1}(0)).$$

This implies the desired result. □

Finally we study the functoriality of the Euler classes of Banach Fredholm bundles. We shall give two kinds of results in two propositions. In some senses they might be viewed as generalizations of Proposition 1.12.

Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be two oriented Banach Fredholm bundles with compact zero loci. A **morphism** from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S') is a pair (f, F) with following properties:

(i) f is a smooth embedding and F is a smooth injective bundle homomorphism covering f, i.e. $\forall x \in X$ the restriction $F_x : E_x \to E'_{f(x)}$ is a continuous linear injective map;

(ii) $S \circ f = F \circ S'$ and $Z(S') = f(Z(S))$;

(iii) For any $x \in Z(S)$ the differential $df(x) : T_xX \to T_{f(x)}X'$ and the above restriction F_x induce isomorphisms

$$df(x) : \mathrm{Ker}(DS(x)) \to \mathrm{Ker}(DS'(f(x))) \quad \text{and}$$
$$[F_x] : \mathrm{Coker}(DS(x)) \to \mathrm{Coker}(DS'(f(x))),$$

and the resulting isomorphism from $\det(DS)$ to $\det(DS')$ is orientation preserving.

By the definition (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') have the same index.

Proposition 1.17 *Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be two oriented Banach Fredholm bundles with compact zero loci, and (f, F) be a morphism from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S'). Then there exist Euler chains N of (X, E, S), and M of (X', E', S'), which are also compact manifolds of the same dimension, such that $f(N) = M \cap f(X)$. Moreover, if $e(E, S)$ and $e(E', S')$ exist then M and N can also be chosen closed manifolds. In particular, $\langle f^*\alpha, e(E, S)\rangle = \langle \alpha, e(E', S')\rangle$ for any $\alpha \in H^*(X', X' \setminus f(X); \mathbb{R})$. (Since M and N have the* *same dimension this means that any connected component of M either is disjoint with $f(X)$ or is contained in $f(X)$. All those components contained in $f(X)$ form $f(N)$.)*

Proof. By the definition of the morphism we may assume: X is a Banach submanifold of X', E is a subbundle of $E'|_X$ and $S = S'|_X$. Of course, both f and F are inclusion maps. By (ii) and (iii) it also holds that $Z(S') = Z(S)$, and that for any $x \in Z(S)$, $DS'(x)|_{T_xX} = DS(x)$, $\mathrm{Ker}(DS(x)) = \mathrm{Ker}(DS'(x))$ and the inclusion $E_x \hookrightarrow E'_x$ induces an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}&E_x/DS(x)(T_xX) \to E'_x/DS'(x)(T_xX'),\\ &v + DS(x)(T_xX) \mapsto v + DS'(x)(T_xX').\end{aligned}$$

The final claim implies: if $v_i \in E_x, i = 1, \cdots, k$ such that $DS(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}\{v_1, \cdots, v_k\} = E_x$ then $DS'(x)(T_xX') + \mathrm{span}\{v_1, \cdots, v_k\} = E'_x$. So we can choose smooth sections of E', $\sigma'_1, \cdots, \sigma'_m$ with supports near $Z(S')$ such that $\sigma_1 = \sigma'_1|_X, \cdots, \sigma_m = \sigma'_m|_X$ are smooth sections of E and that

(I) the sections

$$\Phi : (\mathcal{W} \cap X) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*E,\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(y)$$

$$\Phi' : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*E',\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S'(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma'_i(y)$$

are Fredholm and transversal to the zero section,

(II) the zero sets $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Phi')^{-1}(0)$ have compact closures in $Cl((\mathcal{W} \cap X) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ and $Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ respectively.

Here $\varepsilon > 0$ is very small and $\mathcal{W}$ is an open neighborhood of $Z(S')$ in X'. As usual there exists a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ one gets compact $\mathrm{Ind}(S) = \mathrm{Ind}(S')$ dimensional manifolds $(\Phi_\mathbf{t})^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Phi'_\mathbf{t})^{-1}(0)$. Clearly, $(\Phi_\mathbf{t})^{-1}(0) \subset (\Phi'_\mathbf{t})^{-1}(0)$. Note that one of two connected closed manifolds with the same dimension cannot contain another. When $e(E, S)$ and $e(E', S')$ exist, $(\Phi_\mathbf{t})^{-1}(0)$ must consist of those connected components of $(\Phi'_\mathbf{t})^{-1}(0)$ which are contained in X. The desired results are proved. □

Proposition 1.18 *(***Pull-back***) Let (X, E, S) be a Banach Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. If $f : Y \to X$ is a proper Fredholm map of index d from another Banach manifold Y to X then the natural pullback (Y, f^*E, f^*S) is also a Banach Fredholm bundle with compact zero locus $Z(f^*S)$. Moreover, its index equals to $r + d$ and there exists a Euler chain M (resp. N) of (X, E, S) (resp. (Y, f^*E, f^*S)) such that $f^{-1}(M) = N$. If both Euler classes $e(E, S)$ and $e(f^*E, f^*S)$ exist then M and N can be chosen as closed manifolds.*

If $d = 0$ and X is connected the final claim implies

$$f_*(e(f^*E, f^*S)) = \deg(f)e(E, S)$$

and thus $\langle f^*\alpha, e(f^*E, f^*S)\rangle = \deg(f)\langle\alpha, e(E, S)\rangle$ for any $\alpha \in H^*(X, \mathbb{R})$. Here $\deg(f)$ is understand as follows: If we do not consider the orientation of (X, E, S) and thus $e(E, S) \in H_r(X; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $e(f^*E, f^*S) \in H_r(Y; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ then $\deg(f)$ denotes the topological degree of f mod-2; If (X, E, S) is oriented and one considers the oriented Euler classes $e(E, S) \in H_r(X; \mathbb{Z})$ and $e(f^*E, f^*S) \in H_r(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ then the notion of some kind "orientation" of f shall be needed to define the $\mathbb{Z}$-value topological degree $\deg(f)$ of f. They shall be studied in the future.

Proof of Proposition 1.18. Note that $Z(f^*S) = f^{-1}(Z(S))$ is compact because $Z(S)$ is compact and f is proper. Moreover, for $x_0 \in O \subset X$ and a trivialization $\psi : O \times E_{x_0} \to E|_O$ one has, for a given $y_0 \in f^{-1}(x_0)$, a natural induced trivialization

$$f^*\psi : f^{-1}(O) \times (f^*E)_{y_0} \to (f^*E)|_{f^{-1}(O)},\ (y, v) \mapsto \psi(f(y), v).$$

If $S_\psi : O \to E_{x_0}$ the representation of $S|_O$ under the trivialization ψ then f^*S has, under $f^*\psi$, the corresponding trivialization representation

$$(f^*S)_{f^*\psi} : f^{-1}(O) \to (f^*E)_{y_0},\ y \mapsto S_\psi(f(y)). \tag{1.15}$$

It follows that as the composition of Fredholm maps $(f^*S)_{f^*\psi}$ is Fredholm and $\mathrm{Ind}((f^*S)_{f^*\psi}) = \mathrm{Ind}(f) + \mathrm{Ind}(S_\psi) = d + r$. That is, (Y, f^*E, f^*S) is a Banach Fredholm bundle of index $r + d$. By (1.15),

$$d(f^*S)_{f^*\psi}(y) = dS_\psi(f(y)) \circ df(y) \quad \forall y \in f^{-1}(O).$$

So if there exist finite elements $v_i \in E_{f(y_0)} = E_{x_0}$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$, such that

$$\mathrm{Im}(d(f^*S)_{f^*\psi}(y)) + \mathrm{span}\{v_1, \cdots, v_m\} = E_{x_0},$$

then it easily follows that

$$\mathrm{Im}(dS_\psi(f(y)) + \mathrm{span}\{v_1, \cdots, v_m\} = E_{x_0}$$

because $\mathrm{Im}(d(f^*S)_{f^*\psi}(y)) \subset \mathrm{Im}(dS_\psi(f(y))$.

Let points $x_i \in Z(S)$ and their E-trivialized open neighborhoods O_i in X, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, and smooth sections of E with support in $\mathcal{O}(Z(S))) := \cup_{i=1}^n O_i$, σ_i, $i = 1, \cdots, m$, be such that

$$\mathrm{Im}(dS_{\psi_i}(x)) + \mathrm{span}\{\sigma_{1i}(x), \cdots, \sigma_{mi}(x)\} = E_{x_i}\ \forall x \in O_i, \tag{1.16}$$

where $S_{\psi_{x_i}}, \sigma_{ji} : O_i \to E|_{O_i}$ are representations of S, σ_j under the trivializations $\psi_i : O_i \times E_{x_i} \to E|_{O_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Taking $y_i \in f^{-1}(x_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ then we have

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{Im}(d(f^*S)_{f^*\psi_i}(y)) + \mathrm{span}\{(f^*\sigma_1)_i(y), \cdots, (f^*\sigma_m)_i)(y)\} \\ = (f^*E)_{y_i}\ \forall y \in f^{-1}(O_i)\end{array}\right\} \tag{1.17}$$

Here $(f^*S)_{f^*\psi_{x_i}}, (f^*\sigma_j)_i : f^{-1}(O_i) \to (f^*E)|_{f^{-1}(O_i)}$ are representations of f^*S, $f^*\sigma_j$ under the above pullback trivializations $f^*\psi_i : f^{-1}(O_i) \times (f^*E)_{y_i} \to (f^*E)|_{f^{-1}(O_i)}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Consider the sections

$$\Phi : X \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to E,\ (x, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i \sigma_i(y),$$

$$f^*\Phi : Y \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to f^*E,\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto f^*S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i (f^*\sigma_i)(y).$$

Then it follows from (1.16) and (1.17) that for any $x \in Z(S)$ and $y \in Z(f^*S)$ the maps

$$D\Phi(x, 0) : T_xX \times \mathbb{R}^m \to E_x \quad \text{and}$$
$$D(f^*\Phi)(y, 0) : T_yY \times \mathbb{R}^m \to (f^*E)_y$$

are onto. Thus there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in X, that $\mathcal{W}^* \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{W})$ of $Z(f^*S)$ in Y, $\varepsilon > 0$, and a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the restriction of $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}$ to $\mathcal{W}$ and that of $(f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}} = f^*(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}})$ to $\mathcal{W}^*$ are transversal to the zero section. So the sets $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ and $((f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}^*})^{-1}(0)$ are respectively closed manifolds of dimensions r and $r + d$ for small $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. Clearly,

$$((f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}^*})^{-1}(0) \subset f^{-1}((\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)).$$

Moreover, since f is proper it is easily proved that for any open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(f^*S)$ in Y there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ in X such that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{U}$. It follows from this and Theorem 1.5(A) that $f^{-1}((\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)) \subset \mathcal{W}^*$ for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ small enough. For such a $\mathbf{t}$, one easily checks that $f^{-1}((\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)) \subset ((f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}^*})^{-1}(0)$. So we get

$$f^{-1}(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)) = (f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \tag{1.18}$$

for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ small enough. Clearly, if both $e(E, S)$ and $e(f^*E, f^*S)$ exist then $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0)$ and $((f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}^*})^{-1}(0)$ are closed manifolds for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ sufficiently small. Note that $e(f^*E, f^*S) = [((f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}^*}^{-1}(0)]$ and $e(E, S) = [f^{-1}((\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}})^{-1}(0))]$. The desired results are proved. $\square$

2 The virtual Euler cycles of Banach Fredholm orbibundles

As stated in Introduction the purpose of this section is to give a way in which we can construct an analogue of the Euler cycle in §1, called **virtual Euler cycle**, for the Banach Fredholm orbibundles.

2.1 Banach orbifolds and orbibundles

Orbifolds were first defined and studied by Satake in [Sat1] and [Sat2] (he used the term "V-manifold", the term "orbifold" is due to Thurston [Thu]). Before introducing our definition of a Banach orbifold we recall a basic result due to Newman in the theory of compact transformation groups. If a finite group Γ acts effectively on a connected manifold N of finite dimension, then Newman theorem [Dr, Theorem 1] claims that the set of points with trivial isotropy group is open and everywhere dense. (Here the effective action means that the intersection of all isotropy groups, $\cap_{x\in N}\Gamma_x$, only consists of the unit element $\mathbb{1}$.) It follows that for any $x \in N$ the restriction action of the isotropy group Γ_x to a Γ_x-invariant connected open neighborhood of x is also effective. However, when N is of infinite dimension, Newman theorem fails, for such a fact we can neither know how to prove it nor find a place where this fact is proved. Thus a notion of an induced chart cannot be defined in the effective category. This essential difference between finite dimension and infinite dimension shows that the effectness condition is weaker in the infinitely dimensional case and will not be able to be used to complete some important arguments as in the case of finite dimension if we completely imitate the definition of orbifolds of finite dimension to define orbifolds of infinite dimension. Our strategies are to drop the effectness condition in a definition of Banach orbifold charts of infinite dimension and then add stronger conditions when necessary.

Definition 2.1 Let X be a paracompact Hausdorff topological space. A **Banach** (or **B-**) **orbifold chart** on X is a triple $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$, where U (resp. $\widetilde{U}$) is a connected open subset of X (resp. a Banach manifold), Γ_U is a finite group which acts on $\widetilde{U}$ by C^∞-automorphisms of $\widetilde{U}$, and π_U is a continuous surjective map from $\widetilde{U}$ to U such that for any $x \in \widetilde{U}$ and $g \in \Gamma_U$, $\pi_U(gx) = \pi_U(x)$, and that the induced map $\widetilde{U}/\Gamma_U \to U$ is a homeomorphism. (One often call $\widetilde{U}$ as a **local cover**, Γ_U as a **local group**, U the **support of the chart**, and π_U as a **local covering map**).

Note that π_U is always **proper** by Proposition 1.7 on the page 102 of [B]. In fact, a map from a Hausdorff space into another Hausdorff space is proper if it is closed and the pre-image of every point is also compact. For any $x \in U$ and $\tilde{x} \in (\pi_U)^{-1}(x)$ let $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ be the **isotropy group** of Γ_U at $\tilde{x}$, i.e., $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) = \{g \in \Gamma_U \,|\, g\cdot\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}\}$. Clearly, if $\tilde{y} \in (\pi_U)^{-1}(x)$ is another element, then there exists $g \in \Gamma_U$ such that $g\tilde{y} = \tilde{x}$. It follows that

$\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \to \Gamma_U(\tilde{y}),\ h \mapsto g^{-1}hg$, is a group isomorphism. If

$$\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) = \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U}) := \{g \in \Gamma_U \mid gx = x\ \forall x \in \widetilde{U}\},$$

$\tilde{x}$ is called a **regular point**, otherwise it is called a **singular point**. Denote $\widetilde{U}^\circ$ (resp. $\widetilde{U}^{sing}$) by the set of all regular (resp. singular) points of $\widetilde{U}$. We also denote $\Gamma_U\tilde{x}$ by the orbit of $\tilde{x}$, i.e., $\Gamma_U\tilde{x} = \{g(\tilde{x}) \mid g \in \Gamma_U\}$.

The following lemmas come from Lemmas 1.1, 1.2 in [LuW]. For convenience we also write its proof.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ be a Banach orbifold chart as above. Then for any $x \in U$ and $\tilde{x} \in (\pi_U)^{-1}(x)$, there exists a connected open neighborhood $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) \subset \widetilde{U}$ of $\tilde{x}$ such that*

- **(i)** *$\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$ is $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$-invariant, and $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) \to \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}),\ \tilde{y} \mapsto g \cdot \tilde{y}$ is a homeomorphism for any $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$;*
- **(ii)** *$h(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})) \cap \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) = \emptyset$ for any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$;*
- **(iii)** *$(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi^x_U = \pi_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ and $(g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(g\tilde{x}), \pi^{gx}_U = \pi_U|_{g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ for any $g \in \Gamma_U$ are Banach orbifold charts on X; Moreover, $h(g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})) \cap g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) = \emptyset$ for any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(g\tilde{x})$.*

The Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi^x_U = \pi_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ in Lemma 2.2 is called an **induced chart** of $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ at $\tilde{x}$ (or x). It follows from Lemma 2.2 that the connected component of $\pi_U^{-1}(O(x))$ containing $\tilde{x}$ is $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$ because $\pi_U^{-1}(O(x))$ is equal to the union of $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$ and $\cup_{g \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} g \cdot \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2 If $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) = \Gamma_U$, we can take $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) = \widetilde{U}$. So we may assume $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \neq \Gamma_U$. For any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}),\ h(\tilde{x}) \neq \tilde{x}$, we can always find an open neighborhood V_h of $\tilde{x}$ such that $h(V_h) \cap V_h = \emptyset$. Then $V_1 := \cap_{h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} V_h$ is also an open neighborhood of $\tilde{x}$ and satisfies $h(V_1) \cap V_1 = \emptyset$ for any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$. Since $g(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}$ for any $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$, there must exist an open neighborhood V_g of $\tilde{x}$ such that $g(V_g) \subset V_1$. Set $V_2 := \cap_{g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} V_g$, we have $g(V_2) \subset V_1$ for any $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$. Take a connected open neighborhood V of $\tilde{x}$ such that $V \subset V_1 \cap V_2$. Then $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) := \cup_{g \in\ \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} g(V)$ is also a connected open neighborhood of $\tilde{x}$ and satisfies (i) obviously. To see that it also satisfies (ii), note that for any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})) \cap \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) \quad &= (\bigcup_{g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} hg(V)) \bigcap (\bigcup_{g' \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} g'(V)) \\ &= \bigcup_{g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} \bigcup_{g' \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} (hg(V) \cap g'(V)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $hg \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$, $V \subset V_1$ implies $hg(V) \cap V_1 = \emptyset$, and $V \subset V_2$ implies $g'(V) \subset V_1$. Hence $hg(V) \cap g'(V) = \emptyset$, and thus $h(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})) \cap \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) = \emptyset$.

For (iii), it is clear that $O(x) = \pi_U(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}))$ is an open subset in U (and so in X) since π_U is an open map. Next, for any $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ and $\tilde{y} \in \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$, we have $\tilde{x}_{\tilde{y}} := g^{-1}(\tilde{y}) \in \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$ and $g(\tilde{x}_{\tilde{y}}) = \tilde{y}$ because $g^{-1} \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$. It implies

$g|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})} : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$ is a surjective map and thus a homeomorphism. Finally, we show that $\pi_U^x : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) \to O(x)$ induces the following homeomorphism

$$\overline{\pi_U^x} : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})/\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \to O(x),\ [\tilde{y}]_{\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} \mapsto \pi_U^x(\tilde{y}) = \pi_U(\tilde{y}).$$

where $\tilde{y} \in \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$, $[\tilde{y}]_{\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} := \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})\tilde{y}$. In fact, it suffices to prove that $\overline{\pi_U^x}$ is injective and open. Assume $\overline{\pi_U^x}\left([\tilde{y}_1]_{\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})}\right) = \overline{\pi_U^x}\left([\tilde{y}_2]_{\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})}\right)$ for $\tilde{y}_1,\ \tilde{y}_2 \in \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$. Then $\pi_U^x(\tilde{y}_1) = \pi_U(\tilde{y}_1) = \pi_U(\tilde{y}_2) = \pi_U^x(\tilde{y}_2)$, and thus there exists a $g_0 \in \Gamma_U$ such that $\tilde{y}_1 = g_0(\tilde{y}_2)$. Note that $h(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})) \cap \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) = \emptyset$ for any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$. We get $g_0 \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ and $[\tilde{y}_1]_{\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})} = [\tilde{y}_2]_{\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})}$.

Let A be the open subset of $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})/\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ and $q_U^x : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})/\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ be the quotient map. Then $(q_U^x)^{-1}(A)$ is open in $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})$ (and so in $\widetilde{U}$). Since $\pi_U : \widetilde{U} \to U$ is an open map, $\pi_U((q_U^x)^{-1}(A))$ is an open subset of U. Note that $\pi_U((q_U^x)^{-1}(A)) = \pi_U^x((q_U^x)^{-1}(A)) \subset O(x)$. We get that $\pi_U^x((q_U^x)^{-1}(A))$ is an open subset of $O(x)$. Moreover, $\overline{\pi_U^x}(A) = \pi_U^x((q_U^x)^{-1}(A))$. It follows that $\overline{\pi_U^x}$ is open.

For any $g \in \Gamma_U$, $(g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(g\tilde{x}), \pi_U^{gx} = \pi_U|_{g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ is also a Banach orbifold chart on X since $\Gamma_U(g\tilde{x}) = \{ghg^{-1} \,|\, h \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})\}$. □

For two Banach orbifold charts $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ on X, an **injection** from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ is a pair $\theta_{UV} = (\tilde{\theta}_{UV}, \gamma_{UV})$, where $\gamma_{UV} : \Gamma_U \to \Gamma_V$ is an injective group homomorphism and $\tilde{\theta}_{UV} : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{V}$ is a γ_{UV}-equivariant open embedding such that $\pi_U = \pi_V \circ \tilde{\theta}_{UV}$ and the following **maximality condition** holds:

$$\mathrm{Im}(\gamma_{UV}) = \{g \in \Gamma_V \,|\, \tilde{\theta}_{UV}(\widetilde{U}) \cap g \cdot \tilde{\theta}_{UV}(\widetilde{U}) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

The last condition implies that γ_{UV} induces an isomorphism from $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})$ to $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_V, \widetilde{V})$, where $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U}) = \{g \in \Gamma_U \,|\, gx = x\ \forall x \in \widetilde{U}\}$ and $\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_V, \widetilde{V}) = \{g \in \Gamma_V \,|\, gx = x\ \forall x \in \widetilde{V}\}$. In particular, if $U = V$, γ_{UV} is a group isomorphism, and $\tilde{\theta}_{UV}$ is a diffeomorphism from $\widetilde{U}$ onto $\widetilde{V}$, then these two B-orbifold charts are called **equivalent**, and θ_{UV} is called an **equivalence** between them. Clearly, $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi_U^x = \pi_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ and $(g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(g\tilde{x}), \pi_U^{gx} = \pi_U|_{g\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$, $g \in \Gamma_U$ are equivalent Banach orbifold charts on X.

Definition 2.3 Let X be a paracompact Hausdorff topological space. A **Banach orbifold atlas** on X is a collection $\mathcal{A}$ of B-orbifold charts on X satisfying the following properties:

(i) The supports of all charts in $\mathcal{A}$ form a basis for open sets in X.

(ii) For any two charts $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with $U \subset V$ there exists an injection $\theta_{UV} = (\tilde{\theta}_{UV}, \gamma_{UV})$ from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ be two Banach orbifold atlases on X. If for each chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ there exists a chart $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ in $\mathcal{A}'$ and an injection from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ we say $\mathcal{A}$ to be a **refinement** of $\mathcal{A}'$. Such two atlases on X are said to be **equivalent** if they have a common refinement. It may be proved that this is indeed an equivalence relation among the Banach orbifold atlases on X. Denote by $[\mathcal{A}]$ the equivalent class of the atlas $\mathcal{A}$ on X. It is called a **Banach orbifold structure** on X and the pair $(X, [\mathcal{A}])$ is called a **Banach orbifold**, usually only denoted by X without occurring of confusions. Any atlas in $[\mathcal{A}]$ is called an **atlas** of $(X, [\mathcal{A}])$. We say that $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ is a **Banach orbifold chart of** $(X, [\mathcal{A}])$ if it belongs to some atlas $\mathcal{B}$ in $[\mathcal{A}]$. Later we always assume that the atlas $\mathcal{A}$ is the maximal one in the equivalence class containing it. A Banach orbifold $(X, [\mathcal{A}])$ is called an **effective Banach orbifold** if $[\mathcal{A}]$ contains an atlas $\mathcal{A}$ such that each chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ is **effective** in the sense that Γ_U acts on $\widetilde{U}$ effectively. In this case the atlas $\mathcal{A}$ is called an **effective Banach orbifold atlas**. It is easily shown that every Banach orbifold X induces an effective Banach orbifold.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Banach orbifold atlas on X, $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ be two charts in $\mathcal{A}$ with $U \subset V$ and $\theta_{UV} = (\tilde{\theta}_{UV}, \gamma_{UV})$ be an injection from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$. For $x \in U$ and $\tilde{x} \in \pi_U^{-1}(x)$ the maximality condition implies that γ_{UV} induces an isomorphism from $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ to $\Gamma_V(\tilde{\theta}_{UV}(\tilde{x}))$. Thus using Definition 2.3 every $x \in X$ determines a group Γ_x, unique up to isomorphism, which is isomorphic to the isotropy group of any lift of x in any chart of $\mathcal{A}$. (Sometimes Γ_x is simply called the **isotropy group** of x.) The orders of these groups define a locally constant function on X, which is called the **multiplicity function** $\mathfrak{mul}_X : X \to \mathbb{N}$. Given any finite group G, the connected components of the set of all x such that $\Gamma_x \cong G$ are smooth Banach manifolds. This leads to a decomposition $X = \cup_i X_i$ having the properties: X_i is a connected Banach manifold and consists of points of a fixed isotropy group, Γ_i; moreover for $i \neq j$, X_i meets the closure of X_j only if Γ_i is an abstract subgroup of Γ_i. Each connected component of X has a unique open connected stratum (called principal stratum) X_* on which the corresponding isotropy group Γ_* is minimal, i.e. $\sharp\Gamma_* = \min \mathfrak{mul}_X$. A point $x \in X$ is said to be **regular** (resp. **singular**) if its lift in some chart of $\mathcal{A}$ is regular (resp. singular). Denote by X° (resp. X^{sing}) the set of regular (resp. singular) points in X. Clearly, X° is equal to the union of all principal strata of X.

If each local cover $\widetilde{U}$ in the definition of Banach orbifolds above is replaced by a connected open subset of some Banach manifold with boundary (resp. corner) and the action of Γ_U is required to preserve the boundary (resp. corner) we obtain the **Banach orbifold with boundary (resp. corner)**. If each local cover $\widetilde{U}$ in the above definition is a connected open subset of some separable Banach manifold we say X to be a **separable** Banach orbifold. It is not hard to prove that if X is a Banach orbifold with boundary then its boundary ∂X also inherits a Banach orbifold structure from X and becomes a Banach orbifold.

A topological subspace Z of a Banach orbifold X is called a **Banach suborbifold** of X if it is a Banach orbifold with respect to the induced Banach orbifold structure obtained as follows: For each Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ of X with $U \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ there exists a Banach submanifold $\widetilde{Z}_U \subset \widetilde{U}$ that is not only stable under Γ_U but also compatible with the inclusion maps, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{Z}_U, \Gamma_U|_{\widetilde{Z}_U}, \pi_U|_{\widetilde{Z}_U})$ is a Banach orbifold chart for Z.

A Banach orbifold X of finite dimension is called **locally oriented** if it has an atlas $\mathcal{A}$ such that for each chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma, \pi_U)$ in $\mathcal{A}$, $\widetilde{U}$ is **oriented** and each element of Γ_U is orientation preserving. In this case we say the chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma, \pi_U)$ to be **oriented**. X is called **oriented** if it has an atlas $\mathcal{A}$ such that each chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma, \pi_U)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is oriented, and that for any two charts $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with $U \subset V$ the injection $\theta_{UV} = (\tilde{\theta}_{UV}, \gamma_{UV})$ from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ is orientation preserving.

Lemma 2.4 *Let $(X, \mathcal{A})$ be a Banach orbifold, $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ be a chart in $\mathcal{A}$, and $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi_U^x = \pi_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ be the induced chart at $\tilde{x} \in \pi_U^{-1}(x)$ as in Lemma 2.2. Then*
(i) *Any chart $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with $x \in W \subset O(x)$ has the properties: the injection $\theta_{WU} = (\tilde{\theta}_{WU}, \gamma_{WU})$ from $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ to $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ induces an isomorphism from Γ_W to $\Gamma_U(g\tilde{x})$ for some $g \in \Gamma_U$. So the chart $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ is equivalent to the chart $(\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\widetilde{W}), \Gamma_U(g\tilde{x}), \pi_U|_{\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\widetilde{W})})$ and thus to the chart $(g^{-1}\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\widetilde{W}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi_U|_{g^{-1}\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\widetilde{W})})$. (***Note that the last two charts are also the induced charts of** $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ **at** $g\tilde{x}$ **and** $\tilde{x}$ **respectively.**) Hence for any given $x \in U$, $\tilde{x} \in \pi_U^{-1}(U)$ and a neighborhood V of x there exists an induced chart of $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ at $\tilde{x}$, $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi_U^x = \pi_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})})$ which is equivalent to a chart in $\mathcal{A}$ and such that $O(x) = \pi_U(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x})) \subset V$. This chart $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}), \pi_U^x)$ is also effective if $\mathcal{A}$ is an effective atlas.*
(ii) *For finite charts in $\mathcal{A}$, $(\widetilde{U}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, if $x \in \cap_{i=1}^n U_i$ and $\tilde{x}_i \in \pi_i^{-1}(x)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, then there exist induced charts of $(\widetilde{U}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ at $\tilde{x}_i$, $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i), \Gamma_i(\tilde{x}_i), \pi_i|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i)})$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ having the same support contained in a given neighborhood of x, and equivalences from $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1), \Gamma_1(\tilde{x}_1), \pi_1|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1)})$ to $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i), \Gamma_i(\tilde{x}_i), \pi_i|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i)})$ that map $\tilde{x}_1$ to $\tilde{x}_i$, $i = 2, \cdots, n$. Of course, these induced chart are also effective if the atlas $\mathcal{A}$ is effective.*

Proof. (i) Since $W \subset O(x) \subset U$, it follows from the definition of the injection that $\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\widetilde{W}) \subset \pi_U^{-1}(O(x))$. By Lemma 2.2 and the arguments below Lemma 2.2 we may assume that $\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\widetilde{W}) \subset \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u)$ for some $\tilde{x}_u \in \pi_U^{-1}(x)$. Let $\tilde{x}_w \in \pi_W^{-1}(x)$ be such that $\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\tilde{x}_w) = \tilde{x}_u$. By the maximality condition each $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}_u)$ sits in $\tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(\Gamma_W)$. Moreover, for any $h \in \Gamma_W$ we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(h)\tilde{x}_u = \tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(h)\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\tilde{x}_w) = \tilde{\theta}_{WU}(h\tilde{x}_w) \subset \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u)$ and

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(h)\tilde{x}_u = \tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(h)\tilde{\theta}_{WU}(\tilde{x}_w) = \tilde{\theta}_{WU}(h\tilde{x}_w) \in \pi_U^{-1}(x)$$

because $\pi_W = \pi_U \circ \tilde{\theta}_{WU}$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(h)\tilde{x}_u = \tilde{x}_u$. This shows that $\tilde{\gamma}_{WU}(\Gamma_W) = \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}_u)$ and thus $\tilde{\gamma}_{WU}$ induces an isomorphism from Γ_W to $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x}_u)$. Other claims are easily seen from the arguments above.

(ii) For the remainder we only need to prove the final claim. For a given neighborhood V of x, since all supports of charts in $\mathcal{A}$ form a topology basis for X we can find a chart $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $W \subset V$. As above we can also construct induced charts of $(\widetilde{U}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ at $\tilde{x}_i$, $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i), \Gamma_i(\tilde{x}_i), \pi_i|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i)})$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that they are all equivalent to $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ and that the equivalence from $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i), \Gamma_i(\tilde{x}_i), \pi_i|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i)})$ to $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ can be chosen to map all $\tilde{x}_1, \cdots, \tilde{x}_n$ to the same $\tilde{x}_w \in \pi_W^{-1}(x)$. The desired claim follows easily. □

Now let us study the structures of X^{sing} and X°. For points $x \in U \cap X^{sing}$ and $\tilde{x} \in \pi_U^{-1}(x)$, it follows from Theorem B.1 that there exists a $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$-equivariant diffeomorphism F from a neighborhood $N(0_{\tilde{x}})$ of the origin in $T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{U}$ onto a neighborhood of $\tilde{x}$ in $\widetilde{U}$, $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}) = F(N(0_{\tilde{x}}))$. That is, $F(dg(\tilde{x})\tilde{v}) = g \cdot F(\tilde{v})$ for any $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ and $\tilde{v} \in N(0_{\tilde{x}})$. We may shrink $N(0_{\tilde{x}})$ so that $h(\mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})) \cap \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}) = \emptyset$ for any $h \in \Gamma_U \setminus \Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$. This implies that $\Gamma_U(\tilde{y}) = \{g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \,|\, g\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}\}$ for any $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})$. Let $\nu(dg(\tilde{x})) = \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbb{1} - dg(\tilde{x}))$. It is easily proved that

$$\pi_U^{-1}(X^{sing}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}) = \bigcup_{g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})} F\big(N(0_{\tilde{x}}) \cap \nu(dg(\tilde{x}))\big). \tag{2.1}$$

So for each $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})$ the submanifold $F\big(N(0_{\tilde{x}}) \cap \nu(dg(\tilde{x}))\big) \subset \widetilde{U}$, which is relatively closed in $\widetilde{U}$, is exactly the set of fixed points of g in $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})$, denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})^g$, and $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})^{sing} = \cup_{g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})^g$. We define **singular codimension** of $\widetilde{U}$ near $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{U}^{sing}$ and that of X near $x \in X^{sing}$, denoted by

$$\mathrm{codim}_{\tilde{x}} \widetilde{U}^{sing} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{codim}_x X^{sing},$$

to be $\min\{\mathrm{codim} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x})^g \,|\, g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})\}$. Clearly, the functions

$$\tilde{x} \mapsto \mathrm{codim}_{\tilde{x}} \widetilde{U}^{sing} \quad \text{and} \quad x \mapsto \mathrm{codim}_x X^{sing}$$

are upper semi-continuous. As it happens, it is possible that $dg(\tilde{x}) = id$ for some $g \in \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}) \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})$. So in this case $\widetilde{U}^{sing}$ contains an open neighborhood of $\tilde{x}$ in $\widetilde{U}$. This shows that $\widetilde{U}^\circ$ cannot be dense in $\widetilde{U}$. When $\mathrm{codim}_x X^{sing} \geq 1$ at any $x \in X^{sing}$, it is easily seen that the regular point set X°, is a dense open subset in X (in fact is a complementary set of a sparse subset of X). For integer $k \geq 1$, we say the Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to be k**-regular** if the codimension of $\widetilde{U}^{sing}$ near any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{U}^{sing}$ is not less than k. It means that the fixed point set $\widetilde{U}^g$ of any $g \in \Gamma_U \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_U, \widetilde{U})$ has codimension not less than k near any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{U}^g$. So for any k-regular Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$, $\widetilde{U}^\circ$ is a dense open subset in $\widetilde{U}$. A Banach orbifold X is called a k**-regular Banach orbifold** if every orbifold chart of it is k-regular. In this case X^{sing} is a sparse subset of X and $X^\circ = X \setminus X^{sing}$. Summarizing the arguments above we get:

Claim 2.5 *For a* 1*-regular Banach orbifold* X*,* X° *is a dense open subset in* X *and* X^{sing} *is the union of finitely many suborbifolds of positive codimension* locally.

If X is a 1-regular oriented orbifold of finite dimension then it is also 2-regular because 1 can only be an eigenvalue of $dg(\tilde{x})$ of even algebraic multiplicity. Moreover, any 1-regular complex orbifold is 2-regular. From the definitions above it is easily seen that an effective Banach orbifold is not necessarily 1-regular, and conversely any k-regular Banach orbifold is not necessarily an effective Banach orbifold. In Remark 1.4 of [Sie] it was also shown how to construct a Banach orbifold structure on a Hausdorff topological space X with a family of 2-regular Banach orbifold charts on X whose supports cover X.

Another important notion is a smooth map between orbifolds.

Definition 2.6 For $0 < k \leq \infty$, a continuous map f from a Banach orbifold X to another Banach orbifold X' is said to be C^k**-smooth** if there exist Banach orbifold atlases $\mathcal{A}_X$ on X and $\mathcal{A}_{X'}$ on X' such that:

(i) There is a correspondence

$$\mathcal{A}_X \to \mathcal{A}_{X'},\ (\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) \to (\widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'}, \pi_{U'})$$

satisfying: $f(U) \subset U'$ and there exist a homomorphism $\varphi_U : \Gamma_U \to \Gamma_{U'}$ and a φ_U-equivariant C^k-map $\tilde{f}_U : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{U}'$ such that $\pi_{U'} \circ \tilde{f}_U = f \circ \pi_U$. (Later we often say $(\tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) \to (\widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'}, \pi_{U'})$ to be a **local representation** of f near x. Note that for any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{U}$ the homomorphism φ_U maps the isotropy groups $\Gamma_U(\tilde{x})$ to $\Gamma_{U'}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}))$.)

(ii) If $(\tilde{f}_V, \varphi_V) : (\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V) \to (\widetilde{V}', \Gamma_{V'}, \pi_{V'})$ be another local representation of f as in (i), and $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$, then for any $x \in U \cap V$, $\tilde{x}_u \in (\pi_U)^{-1}(x)$ and $\tilde{x}_v \in (\pi_V)^{-1}(x)$ there exist equivalent induced charts at x and $f(x)$ respectively,

$$(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}_u), \pi_U^x) \quad \text{and} \quad (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v), \Gamma_V(\tilde{x}_v), \pi_V^x),$$
$$(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}_u)), \Gamma_{U'}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}_u)), \pi_{U'}^{f(x)}) \text{ and } (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_V(\tilde{x}_v)), \Gamma_{V'}(\tilde{f}_V(\tilde{x}_v)), \pi_{V'}^{f(x)}),$$

and the corresponding equivalences $(\lambda_{UV}, \mathcal{A}_{UV})$ (mapping $\tilde{x}_u$ to $\tilde{x}_v$) and $(\lambda_{U'V'}, \mathcal{A}_{U'V'})$ (mapping $\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}_u)$ to $\tilde{f}_V(\tilde{x}_v)$) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{f}_U\big(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u)\big) \subset \widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}_u)),\\
&\tilde{f}_V\big(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)\big) \subset \widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_V(\tilde{x}_v)) \quad \text{and}\\
&\tilde{f}_V \circ \lambda_{UV} = \lambda_{U'V'} \circ \tilde{f}_U.
\end{aligned}$$

A smooth map f from orbifolds X to X' is called an **orbifold embedding** if it is a homeomorphism to the image $f(X) \subset X'$ and each local representation $\tilde{f}_U : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{U}'$ as above is an embedding.

Now we begin to introduce a notion of Banach orbibundles. Without loss of generality, we always assume that a finite group G acts on a smooth Banach vector bundle E by bundle automorphisms of E.

Definition 2.7 Let X be a Banach orbifold. A **Banach orbibundle over** X consists of a Banach orbifold E and a smooth surjective mapping $p : E \to X$ with the additional requirements:

(i) For each Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ of X there exists a Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ on E with support $E_U = p^{-1}(U)$, such that there exist a smooth Banach bundle structure $\widetilde{p}_U : \widetilde{E}_U \to \widetilde{U}$ and an injective homeomorphism λ_U from Γ_U into the group of bundle automorphisms of $\widetilde{E}_U$ such that:

- (a) For each $g \in \Gamma_U$, $\lambda_U(g)$ is a lift of g (in particular $\lambda_U(g) = \mathbb{1}$ if $g = \mathbb{1}$).
- (b) $\widetilde{\Gamma}_U = \{\lambda_U(g) \,|\, g \in \Gamma_U\}$.
- (c) $\pi_U \circ \widetilde{p}_U = p \circ \Pi_U$ in E_U.

(ii) If $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ are two charts in $\mathcal{U}$ with $U \subset V$, $\theta_{UV} = (\widetilde{\theta}_{UV}, \gamma_{UV})$ is an injection from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$, then there is an injection $\Theta_{UV} = (\widetilde{\Theta}_{UV}, \Gamma_{UV})$ from $(\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{E}_V, \widetilde{\Gamma}_V, \Pi_V)$, such that $\widetilde{\theta}_{UV} \circ \widetilde{p}_U = \widetilde{p}_V \circ \widetilde{\Theta}_{UV}$ and that $\Theta_{UV} = (\widetilde{\Theta}_{UV}, \Gamma_{UV})$ is also a bundle open embedding.

Such a Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ on E is called the **Banach orbibundle chart** corresponding with $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$.

Remark 2.8 Later we often write $(\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ as $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ and understand $g \in \Gamma_U$ to act on $\widetilde{E}_U$ via $G := \lambda_U(g)$, i.e. $g \cdot \tilde{\xi} = G(\tilde{\xi})$ for $\tilde{\xi} \in \widetilde{E}_U$. If X is 1-regular, it follows from Definition 2.7(i) that E is 1-regular as well as.

Definition 2.9 Let $p : E \to X$ and $p' : E' \to X'$ be two Banach orbibundles, $f : X \to X'$ be a C^k-smooth map for $0 < k \leq \infty$ and $\mathcal{A}_X$ and $\mathcal{A}_{X'}$ be respectively Banach orbifold atlases on X and X' associated with f as in Definition 2.6. A continous map $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ is called an C^k**-orbibundle map** covering f if the following are satisfied:

(i) For each local representation of f, $(\tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) \to (\widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'}, \pi_{U'})$ with $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) \in \mathcal{A}_X$ and $(\widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'}, \pi_{U'}) \in \mathcal{A}_{X'}$, there exist corresponding B-orbibundle charts $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ on E, $(\widetilde{E}'_{U'}, \Gamma_{U'}, \Pi_{U'})$ on E' and a φ_U-equivariant bundle map $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U : \widetilde{E}_U \to \widetilde{E}'_{U'}$ covering $\tilde{f}_U$, i.e., $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U$ being a bundle map satisfying $\tilde{p}_{U'} \circ \tilde{\bar{f}}_U = \tilde{f}_U \circ \tilde{p}_U$ and $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U(g \cdot v) = \lambda_U(g) \cdot \tilde{\bar{f}}_U(v)$ for any $g \in \Gamma_U$ and $v \in \widetilde{E}_U$, such that $\Pi_{U'} \circ \tilde{\bar{f}}_U = f|_U \circ \Pi_U$. The triple $(\tilde{\bar{f}}_U, \tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{U'}, \widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'})$ is called a **local representation** of $(\bar{f}, f)$ or $\bar{f}$. For the sake of clearness we later also call the pair $(\bar{f}, f)$ a bundle map.

(ii) Let $(\tilde{\bar{f}}_V, \tilde{f}_V, \varphi_V) : (\widetilde{E}_V, \widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{V'}, \widetilde{V}', \Gamma_{V'})$ be another local representation of $(\bar{f}, f)$ or $\bar{f}$ such that $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$. For any $x \in U \cap V$,

$\tilde{x}_u \in (\pi_U)^{-1}(x)$ and $\tilde{x}_v \in (\pi_V)^{-1}(x)$ let

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\lambda_{UV}, \mathcal{A}_{UV}) : (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}_u), \pi_U^x) \to (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v), \Gamma_V(\tilde{x}_v), \pi_V^x) \text{ and} \\
&(\lambda_{U'V'}, \mathcal{A}_{U'V'}) : (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}_u)), \Gamma_{U'}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}_u)), \pi_{U'}^{f(x)}) \to \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_V(\tilde{x}_v)), \Gamma_{V'}(\tilde{f}_V(\tilde{x}_v)), \pi_{V'}^{f(x)}))
\end{aligned}$$

be as in Definition 2.6. By shrinking $O(x)$ if necessary one can find $\mathcal{A}_{UV}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{U'V'}$)- equivariant bundle isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Lambda_{UV} : \widetilde{E}_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u)} \to \widetilde{E}_V|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)} \text{ covering } \lambda_{UV} \\
&(\text{resp. } \Lambda_{U'V'} : \widetilde{E}_{U'}|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_U(x_u))} \to \widetilde{E}_{V'}|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{f}_V(x_v))} \text{ covering } \lambda_{U'V'})
\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\tilde{\bar{f}}_V \circ \Lambda_{UV} = \Lambda_{U'V'} \circ (\tilde{\bar{f}}_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u)}). \tag{2.2}$$

We say an orbibundle map $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ to be an **orbibundle embedding** if it is also an orbifold embedding. (In particular, this implies that each local representation bundle map $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U : \widetilde{E}_U \to \widetilde{E}'_{U'}$ as above is injective.) An orbibundle map $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ is called an **orbibundle open embedding** (from $E \to X$ to $E' \to X'$) if $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ (and thus $f : X \to X'$) is an open embedding. (*Note*: It implies that for each local representation $(\tilde{\bar{f}}_U, \tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{U'}\widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'})$ of $\bar{f}$ as above both $\tilde{f}_U$ and $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U$ are smooth open embedding and the restriction of $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U$ to each fibre $(\widetilde{E}_U)_{\tilde{z}}$ of $\widetilde{E}_U$ gives a Banach space isomorphism to the fibre $(\widetilde{E}'_{U'})_{\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{z})}$ of $\widetilde{E}'_{U'}$.) In particular, if $\bar{f}$ is also a diffeomorphism we call it an (orbibundle) **isomorphism** from E to E'.

Definition 2.10 For a Banach orbibundle $p : E \to X$ as above, a continuous map $S : X \to E$ is called a **C^k-smooth section** if (i) $p \circ S = id_X$ and (ii) for each $x \in X$ there exist a Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ of X near x, a corresponding bundle chart $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ of E over $\widetilde{U}$, and a C^k-smooth Γ_U-equivariant Banach bundle section $\widetilde{S}_U : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{E}_U$ (i.e. $\widetilde{S}_U(g \cdot \tilde{y}) = g \cdot \widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{y})$ for $\tilde{y} \in \widetilde{U}$ and $g \in \Gamma_U$) such that:

- It is a lift of $S|_U$ on $\widetilde{U}$, i.e. $\Pi_U \circ \widetilde{S}_U = S \circ \pi_U$.
- All $\widetilde{S}_U$ are compatible in the following sense: For any two Banach orbibundle charts $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{E}_V, \Gamma_V, \Pi_V)$, and corresponding Banach orbifold charts $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$, it holds that for any $x \in U \cap V$ there exist an equivalence

$$(\lambda_{UV}, \mathcal{A}_{UV}) : (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u), \Gamma_U(\tilde{x}_u), \pi_U^x) \to (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v), \Gamma_V(\tilde{x}_v), \pi_V^x)$$

as in Definition 2.9, and a bundle isomorphism $\Lambda_{UV} : \widetilde{E}_U|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u)} \to \widetilde{E}_V|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)}$ covering λ_{UV} such that

$$\widetilde{S}_V \circ \lambda_{UV} = \Lambda_{UV} \circ \widetilde{S}_U \quad \text{on} \quad \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u). \tag{2.3}$$

We call $\widetilde{S}_U$ a **local lift** of S in charts $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$. Note that all these $\widetilde{S}_U$ are uniquely determined by S.

It should also be mentioned that an orbifold map $S : X \to E$ satisfying $p \circ S = id_X$ is not necessarily to give rise to a section of E.

Definition 2.11 We say S to be **Fredholm** if each local lift $\widetilde{S}_U$ of S in charts $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ above is so. A triple (X, E, S) consisting of a Banach orbibundle $p : E \to X$ and a Fredholm section $S : X \to E$ is called a **Banach Fredholm orbibundle**. The index of S is called the **index** of (X, E, S).

For a Banach Fredholm orbibundle (X, E, S) and the local lift $\widetilde{S}_U$ of S in the above charts $(\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ one has a determinant (real line) bundle $\det(D\widetilde{S}_U)$ over $Z(\widetilde{S}_U)$. If this determinant line bundle $\det(D\widetilde{S}_U)$ is trivial and is given a continuous nowhere zero section, i.e. $\widetilde{S}_U$ is oriented we say S to be **oriented** on U or simply **locally oriented**. We call S **oriented** if the representative $\widetilde{S}_U$ in each chart $(\widetilde{E}_U, \Gamma_U, \Pi_U)$ of E is oriented and the bundle open embedding $\det(\Theta_{UV})$ from $(\det(D\widetilde{S}_U), \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ to $(\det(D\widetilde{S}_V), \widetilde{\Gamma}_V, \Pi_V)$ that is naturally induced by the bundle open embedding Θ_{UV} from $(\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{\Gamma}_U, \Pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{E}_V, \widetilde{\Gamma}_V, \Pi_V)$ is orientation preserving in the following sense: If $\tilde{\tau}_U$ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}_V$) is the given continuous nowhere zero section of $\det(D\widetilde{S}_U)$ (resp. $\det(D\widetilde{S}_V)$) then for each $x \in \widetilde{V}$, $\det(\Theta_{UV})(\tilde{\tau}_V(x))$ is a positive multiple of $\tilde{\tau}_U\big(\theta_{UV}(x)\big)$. In the case S is oriented we say (X, E, S) to be **oriented**.

Two oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundles $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ of index r and with compact zero locus, $i = 0, 1$, are called **oriented homotopic** if there exists an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle $(X \times [0,1], E, S)$ of index $r+1$ and with compact zero locus such that $E^{(i)} = E|_{\{i\} \times X}$ and $S^{(i)} = S|_{\{i\} \times X}$ for $i = 0, 1$, and that the orientation of $(X \times [0,1], E, S)$ induces those of $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$.

Let $S : X \to E$ and $S' : X' \to E'$ be two smooth sections of Banach orbibundles. S is called a **pullback** of S' via an orbibundle map $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ covering $f : X \to X'$ if $S' \circ f = \bar{f} \circ S$. It means: (i) For any local representation of $\bar{f}$ as above, $(\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U, \tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{U'}, \widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'})$, and the local lifting of S, $\widetilde{S}_U : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{E}_U$, and one of S', $\widetilde{S}'_{U'} : \widetilde{U}' \to \widetilde{E}'_{U'}$ it holds that

$$\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U \circ \widetilde{S}_U = \widetilde{S}'_{U'} \circ \tilde{f}_U. \tag{2.4}$$

(ii) If $(\tilde{\tilde{f}}_V, \tilde{f}_V, \varphi_V) : (\widetilde{E}_V, \widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{V'}, \widetilde{V}', \Gamma_{V'})$ is another local representation of $\bar{f}$ with $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ then for any $x \in U \cap V$, in the notations of Definition 2.9 it also holds that

$$\Lambda_{U'V'} \circ \tilde{\tilde{f}}_U \circ \widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{y}) = \widetilde{S}'_{V'} \circ \tilde{f}_V \circ \lambda_{UV}(\tilde{y}) \quad \forall \tilde{y} \in \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_u). \tag{2.5}$$

A natural question is: Under what the conditions can the section S' be determined by S and $\bar{f}$?

Claim 2.12 *The answer is affirmative if each local lifting of $\bar{f}$ restricts to a Banach isomorphism on each fiber.*

Proof. Let $(\tilde{\bar{f}}_U, \tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{U'}, \widetilde{U}', \Gamma_{U'})$ be a local representation of $\bar{f}$ as above. By the assumptions, for any $\tilde{y} \in \widetilde{U}$,

$$(\tilde{\bar{f}}_U)_{\tilde{y}} : (\widetilde{E}_U)_{\tilde{y}} \to (\widetilde{E}_{U'})_{\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y})}$$

is a Banach space isomorphism. So we can define a smooth section

$$\widetilde{S}_U : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{E}_U,\ \tilde{y} \mapsto (\tilde{\bar{f}}_U)^{-1}_{\tilde{y}}\big(\widetilde{S}'_{U'} \circ \tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y})\big). \tag{2.6}$$

If $(\tilde{\bar{f}}_V, \tilde{f}_V, \varphi_V) : (\widetilde{E}_V, \widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{V'}, \widetilde{V}', \Gamma_{V'})$ is another local representation of $\bar{f}$, we can also define another smooth section

$$\widetilde{S}_V : \widetilde{V} \to \widetilde{E}_V,\ \tilde{z} \mapsto (\tilde{\bar{f}}_V)^{-1}_{\tilde{z}}\big(\widetilde{S}'_{V'} \circ \tilde{f}_V(\tilde{z})\big). \tag{2.7}$$

If $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ we need to prove that (2.3) holds. Indeed, following the notations in Definition 2.9, for any $\tilde{y} \in O(\tilde{x}_u)$ let $\tilde{z} = \lambda_{UV}(\tilde{y})$. Then by (2.6) and (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{S}_V \circ \lambda_{UV}(\tilde{y}) \quad &= \widetilde{S}_V(\tilde{z}) \\
&= (\tilde{\bar{f}}_V)^{-1}_{\tilde{z}}\big(\widetilde{S}'_{V'} \circ \tilde{f}_V(\tilde{z})\big) \\
&= (\tilde{\bar{f}}_V)^{-1}_{\tilde{z}}\big(\widetilde{S}'_{V'} \circ \tilde{f}_V \circ \lambda_{UV}(\tilde{y})\big) \\
&= (\tilde{\bar{f}}_V)^{-1}_{\tilde{z}}\big(\Lambda_{U'V'} \circ \tilde{\bar{f}}_U \circ \widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{y})\big) \\
&= \Lambda_{UV} \circ \widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{y}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth and fifth equalities come from (2.5) and (2.2) respectively. □

Definition 2.13 Let $p : E \to X$ be a Banach orbibundle and $f : Y \to X$ be a smooth map between Banach orbifolds. A **pull-back Banach orbibundle** of E over Y via f is a Banach orbibundle $f^*E \to Y$ together with a smooth orbibundle map $\bar{f} : f^*E \to E$ covering $f : Y \to X$ and such that each local lifting of $\bar{f}$ restricts to a Banach space isomorphism on each fiber. Claim 2.12 shows that for each smooth section $S : X \to E$ one can get a smooth section of $f^*E \to Y$ by pullback via $\bar{f}$, denoted by f^*S.

Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be Banach Fredholm orbibundles, and $f : X \to X'$ be a Fredholm map. An orbibundle map $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ covering f is called a **Fredholm orbibundle map** from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S') if $S' \circ f = \bar{f} \circ S$, i.e., S is the pullback of S' via $\bar{f}$.

Let $E \to X$ be a Banach orbibundle and (X', E', S') be a Banach Fredholm orbibundle. Let $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ be an orbibundle map covering a Fredholm map $f : X \to X'$ and $S : X \to E$ be the pullback of S' via $\bar{f}$. From (2.4) it is not hard to see that S is not necessarily Fredholm. Clearly, we have:

Claim 2.14 *If $\bar{f}$ satisfies the assumption in Claim 2.12 then S is also Fredholm and* $\mathrm{Index}(S) = \mathrm{Index}(f) + \mathrm{Index}(S')$.

Consequently, for a Fredholm Banach orbibundle (X, E, S) of index r and a Fredholm map of index d from a Banach manifold Y to X, if $\bar{f} : f^*E \to Y$ is a pullback bundle of E on Y via f then one has a pullback Fredholm section $f^*S : Y \to f^*E$ of index $r + d$. The Fredholm bundle (Y, f^*E, f^*S) is called the **pullback Fredholm Banach orbibundle** of (X, E, S) via f.

When the word "Banach" above is replaced by the word "Hilbert" we get the definitions of the **Hilbert orbifold**, **Hilbert orbibundle** and **Hilbert Fredholm orbibundle**.

Similarly we have also the notions of complex Banach orbifolds, holomorphic Banach orbibundles and holomorphic sections.

2.2 An overall strategy and an example

The method developed by Liu-Tian in [LiuT1]-[LiuT3] is beautiful and complicated. In this subsection we explain the overall strategy for their constructions and then give an example to show that this method can be used to calculate the orbifold Euler characteristic of an orbifold. Without special statements we always **assume that all Banach orbifolds are 1-regular** in this section.

Consider a Banach orbifold $(X, \mathcal{A})$ and assume that there exist two charts in $\mathcal{A}$, $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $W_1 \cup W_2 = X$. By them we can understand "orbifoldness" of X on W_1 and W_2 respectively. This means that on the intersection $W_{12} := W_1 \cap W_2$ one has two kinds of understanding ways. By the definition of orbifolds (cf. Lemma 2.4) we can know that one can get the same "orbifold information" near any point $x \in W_{12}$ in these two kinds of ways (local change of coordinates). However, we have no a "global" understanding on W_{12}.

Firstly, assume X is a manifold and $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ become the usual coordinate charts $(\widetilde{W}_i, \{1\!\!1\}, \pi_i) \equiv (\widetilde{W}_i, \pi_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. In this case there exists a diffeomorphism $\varphi : \pi_1^{-1}(W_1 \cap W_2) \to \pi_2^{-1}(W_1 \cap W_2)$ such that $\pi_2 \circ \varphi = \pi_1$. That is, φ is the change of coordinates (or transition function). It means that π_1 and π_2 give the same smooth topology information on W_{12}. Consider the graph of φ in $\widetilde{W}_1 \times \widetilde{W}_2$, $\text{Graph}(\varphi) = \{(\tilde{x}, \varphi(\tilde{x})) \,|\, \tilde{x} \in \pi_1^{-1}(W_1 \cap W_2) \subset \widetilde{W}_1\}$, which is a submanifold in $\widetilde{W}_1 \times \widetilde{W}_2$. It is exactly the fiber product $\widetilde{W}_{12} := \{(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) \in \widetilde{W}_1 \times \widetilde{W}_2 \,|\, \pi_1(\tilde{x}_1) = \pi_2(\tilde{x}_2)\}$. Note that the projection $\pi_{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to W_{12}$, $(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) = \pi_1(\tilde{x}_1) = \pi_2(\tilde{x}_2)$ is well-defined. Denote by $\pi_i^{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to \widetilde{W}_i, (\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) \mapsto \tilde{x}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Then the existence of the transition function (diffeomorphism) φ above is equivalent to the following claim:

There exist a smooth manifold $\widetilde{W}_{12}$, a continuous surjective $\pi_{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to W_{12}$, and smooth open embeddings $\pi_i^{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to \widetilde{W}_i$ such that $\pi_i \circ \pi_i^{12} = \pi_{12}, i = 1, 2$.

Now we consider the case that X is an orbifold. In the present case there is no a diffeomorphism such as φ above. We cannot expect that the claim above is true in general. However, the fiber product $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ and the projections $\pi_{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to W_{12}$, $\pi_i^{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to \widetilde{W}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are still well-defined, and also satisfy $\pi_i \circ \pi_i^{12} = \pi_{12}$, $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, π_{12} is invariant under the obvious action $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$ on $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ and also induces a homeomorphism from $\widetilde{W}_{12}/\Gamma_{12}$ to W_{12}; and for $i = 1, 2$ the projections $\pi_i^{12} : \widetilde{W}_{12} \to \widetilde{W}_i$, are equivariant with respect to group homomorphisms

$$\lambda_i^{12} : \Gamma_{12} \to \Gamma_i,\ (g_1, g_2) \mapsto g_i.$$

But it is regrettable that $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ **is not a manifold in general**! What is $\widetilde{W}_{12}$? For any $x \in W_{12}$ and $\tilde{x}_i \in \pi_i^{-1}(x)$, $i = 1, 2$, recall that we have induced charts of $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ at $\tilde{x}_i$, $(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i), \Gamma_i(\tilde{x}_i), \pi_i|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_i)})$, and an equivalence

$$(\lambda_{12}, \mathcal{A}_{12}) : (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1), \Gamma_1(\tilde{x}_1), \pi_1|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1)}) \to (\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_2), \Gamma_2(\tilde{x}_2), \pi_2|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_2)})$$

consisting of a group isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{12} : \Gamma_1(\tilde{x}_1) \to \Gamma_2(\tilde{x}_2)$ and a $\mathcal{A}_{12}$-equivariant diffeomorphism $\lambda_{12} : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1) \to \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_2)$. It follows that the graph of λ_{12}, $\mathrm{Graph}(\lambda_{12})$ is a submanifold of the fiber product $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ which is diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1)$ and $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_2)$. So the graph map $\mathrm{Gr}(\lambda_{12}) : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1) \to \widetilde{W}_1 \times \widetilde{W}_2$, $\tilde{y} \mapsto (\tilde{y}, \lambda_{12}(\tilde{y}))$ is a smooth open embedding with image contained $\widetilde{W}_{12}$. Moreover, for any $g \in \Gamma_2(\tilde{x}_2)$ the composition $(\mathbb{1} \times g) \circ \mathrm{Gr}(\lambda_{12})$ is also such an open embedding. Hence we get that

$$\pi_{12}^{-1}(O(x)) = \cup_{g \in \Gamma_1(\tilde{x}_1)} (\mathbb{1} \times g) \circ \mathrm{Gr}(\lambda_{12})(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1)),$$

that is, an union of $\sharp\Gamma_1(\tilde{x}_1)$ copies of $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1)$. This shows that near $(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2)$ the fiber product $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ is a Banach variety (the union of finitely many Banach manifolds), rather than a Banach manifold in general! Such a good local structure suggests that there is a possible desingularization of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$. Call a nonempty connected relative open subset in $(\mathbb{1} \times g) \circ \mathrm{Gr}(\lambda_{12})(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_1))$ as a **local component** of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ near any point of this open subset. Two local components containing a point $\tilde{y}_{12} \in \widetilde{W}_{12}$ are said to belong to different kinds if their intersection is not a local component of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$. In the disjoint union of all local components of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$, a true Banach manifold, two points are called **equivalent** if both can be contained a local component of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ and are also same as points of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$. It may be proved that this indeed gives rise to a regular relation in the disjoint union of all local components of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$. Let $\widehat{W}_{12}$ denote the manifold of all equivalence classes. (Note that it is not necessarily connected.) The compositions of the natural quotient map from $\widehat{W}_{12}$ to $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ and π_{12}, π_i^{12} give the maps $\hat{\pi}_{12} : \widehat{W}_{12} \to W_{12}$ and $\hat{\pi}_i^{12} : \widehat{W}_{12} \to \widehat{W}_i := \widetilde{W}_i$ satisfying $\hat{\pi}_i \circ \hat{\pi}_i^{12} = \hat{\pi}_{12}$, where $\hat{\pi}_i = \pi_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, the action of Γ_{12} on $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ naturally lifts to an action of Γ_{12} on $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ (which is also effective if the actions of Γ_1 and Γ_2 are effective) such that (i) π_i^{12} are also equivariant with respect to the group homeomorphisms λ_i^{12} above, $i = 1, 2$, and (ii) $\hat{\pi}_{12}$ is invariant under this action and induces a homeomorphism from $\widehat{W}_{12}/\Gamma_{12}$ to W_{12}. In addition the set of regular points in $\widehat{W}_{12}$, $\widehat{W}_{12}^{\circ}$, is exactly $(\hat{\pi}_{12})^{-1}(W_{12}^{\circ})$, and the restrictions of $\hat{\pi}_i^{12}$ to $\widehat{W}_{12}^{\circ}$ are

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{2}(\sharp\Gamma_i - \sharp\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i) + 1)}{\sharp\Gamma_i - \sharp\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i) + 1} - \text{fold (regular) coverings}$$

to $\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_i^{12}) \cap \widehat{W}_i^\circ \subset \widehat{W}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. In summary, we have proved:

There exist an orbifold chart $(\widehat{W}_{12}, \Gamma_{12}, \hat{\pi}_{12})$ for the open subset W_{12} (which is not necessarily in the given orbifold structure on X), surjective group homomorphisms $\lambda_i^{12} : \Gamma_{12} \to \Gamma_i$ and λ_i^{12}-equivariant smooth maps $\hat{\pi}_i^{12} : \widehat{W}_{12} \to \widehat{W}_i$ such that $\hat{\pi}_i \circ \hat{\pi}_i^{12} = \hat{\pi}_{12}$, $i = 1, 2$.

It will be a substitute of the above claim in the case of manifolds. Such a system

$$\big\{(\widehat{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \hat{\pi}_i), (\widehat{W}_{12}, \Gamma_{12}, \hat{\pi}_{12}), \hat{\pi}_i^{12}, \lambda_i^{12} \ \big| \ i = 1, 2\big\}$$

is called a **desingularization** of X, and $\{(\widehat{W}_{12}, \Gamma_{12}, \hat{\pi}_{12}), \hat{\pi}_i^{12}, \lambda_i^{12} \mid i = 1, 2\}$ will be used to replace the transition function between $(\widehat{W}_1, \Gamma_1, \hat{\pi}_1)$ and $(\widehat{W}_2, \Gamma_2, \hat{\pi}_2)$ which does not exist in general. (In order to help the reader understanding the construction of $\widehat{W}_{12}$ we consider a simple example. Let $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ be the union of x-axis l_x and y-axis l_y in $\mathbb{R}^2$, i.e., $\widetilde{W}_{12} = l_x \cup l_y$. Then each local component of $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ is a relatively open subset in x-axis or y-axis. Let 0_x and 0_y denote the origin in x-axis and y-axis respectively. As points in $\widetilde{W}_{12}$ both are same, i.e. $0_x = 0_y \in \widetilde{W}_{12}$. A local component C_x containing 0_x and one C_y containing 0_y are of different kinds if and only if one of both is a nonempty relatively open subset in l_x and another is such an open subset in l_y. Hence our definition of the equivalence above shows that $\widehat{W}_{12}$ is the disjoint union of l_x and l_y.)

Similarly, if $p : E \to X$ is an orbibundle, and $\tilde{p}_i : (\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i) \to (\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, are corresponding orbibundle charts, then we can get a system of Banach bundles

$$\big\{(\widehat{E}_i, \Gamma_i, \hat{\Pi}_i), (\widehat{E}_{12}, \Gamma_{12}, \hat{\Pi}_{12}), \hat{\Pi}_i^{12}, \lambda_i^{12} \ \big| \ i = 1, 2\big\},$$

which is not only a desingularization of E as a Banach orbifold but also there exists a Banach bundle structure $\hat{p}_{12} : \widehat{E}_{12} \to \widehat{W}_{12}$ such that

$$\hat{\pi}_{12} \circ \hat{p}_{12} = p \circ \hat{\Pi}_{12}, \quad \hat{\pi}_i \circ \hat{p}_i = p \circ \hat{\Pi}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{p}_i \circ \hat{\Pi}_i^{12} = \hat{\pi}_i^{12} \circ \hat{p}_i,\ i = 1, 2,$$

where $\widehat{E}_i = \widetilde{E}_i$, $\widehat{W}_i = \widetilde{W}_i$ and $\hat{p}_i = \tilde{p}_i : \widehat{E}_i \to \widehat{W}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. The Banach bundle system above is called a **desingularization** of the orbibundle E (associated with the above desingularization of the orbifold X). Moreover, if $S_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are local representations of a section $S : X \to E$, then we obtain a natural section $\hat{S}_{12} : \widehat{W}_{12} \to \widehat{E}_{12}$ such that it together $\hat{S}_i = \tilde{S}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, forms a collection $\hat{S} = \{\hat{S}_{12}, \hat{S}_1, \hat{S}_2\}$ that is compatible in the sense that $\hat{S}_{12}$ is Γ_{12}-equivariant and $\hat{S}_i = (\hat{\Pi}_i^{12})^* \hat{S}_i := (\hat{\Pi}_i^{12})^{-1} \circ \hat{S}_i \circ \hat{\pi}_i^{12}$, $i = 1, 2$. This collection $\hat{S}$ is called a desingularization of the section $S : X \to E$ associated with the above desingularization of the Banach orbibundle. Any collection with these properties is called a **global section** of the bundle system.

Now assume that the zero locus $Z(S)$ is compact. Choose open subsets $W_i^1 \subset Cl(W_i^1) \subset U_i^1 \subset Cl(U_i^1) \subset W_i$, $i = 1, 2$ such that $Z(S) \subset W_1^1 \cup W_2^1$.

Set

$$V_{12} = W_1 \cap W_2 \quad \text{and} \quad V_i = W_i^1 \setminus Cl(U_1^1) \cap Cl(U_2^1),\ i = 1, 2.$$

It is easily checked that $Z(S) \subset V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_{12}$ and $Cl(V_1) \cap V_2 = \emptyset = Cl(V_2) \cap V_1$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{V}_{12} = (\hat{\pi}_{12})^{-1}(V_{12}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{V}_i = (\hat{\pi}_i)^{-1}(V_i),\ i = 1, 2, \\ &\widehat{F}_{12} = (\hat{\Pi}_{12})^{-1}(E_{12}|_{V_{12}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{F}_i = (\hat{\Pi}_i)^{-1}(E_i|_{V_i}),\ i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

We get a system of Banach bundles

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{\mathcal{V}}) := \big\{(\widehat{F}_i, \Gamma_i, \hat{\Pi}_i), (\widehat{F}_{12}, \Gamma_{12}, \hat{\Pi}_{12}), \hat{p}_{12}, \hat{p}_i, \hat{\Pi}_i^{12}, \lambda_i^{12} \ \big|\ i = 1, 2\big\}$$

over the system of Banach manifolds

$$\big\{(\widehat{V}_i, \Gamma_i, \hat{\pi}_i), (\widehat{V}_{12}, \Gamma_{12}, \hat{\pi}_{12}), \hat{\pi}_i^{12}, \lambda_i^{12} \ \big|\ i = 1, 2\big\}.$$

The notion of a global section of this system is defined in the same way as above. One can prove that each smooth section $\tilde{\sigma} : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ with support in $\widetilde{W}_i^1 := \pi_i^{-1}(W_i^1)$ may yield a global section of the system above, denoted by $\hat{\sigma} = \{(\hat{\sigma})_1, (\hat{\sigma})_2, (\hat{\sigma})_{12}\}$.

Furthermore, choose nonempty open subsets

$$U_i^0 \subset Cl(U_i^0) \subset W_i^1,\ i = 1, 2$$

such that $Z(S) \subset U_1^0 \cup U_2^0$. **We also assume that S is a Fredholm section of index** r, and that $\tilde{p}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ has a trivialization $\mathcal{T}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \times (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Let $\widetilde{S}_i^T : \widetilde{W}_i \to (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$ be the representation of $\widetilde{S}_i$ under the trivialization $\mathcal{T}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Since S is Fredholm we can take finitely many sections $\tilde{\sigma}_i^j : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ with supports in $\widetilde{W}_i^1$ such that their trivialization representations $\tilde{\sigma}_i^{jT} : \widetilde{W}_i \to (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$ and $i = 1, 2$, satisfy

$$d\widetilde{S}_i^T(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i) + \mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}_i^{1T}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \tilde{\sigma}_i^{m_iT}(\tilde{x})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$$

for any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{U}_i^0$ and $i = 1, 2$. Let $\hat{\sigma}_i^j = \{(\hat{\sigma}_i^j)_{12}, (\hat{\sigma}_i^j)_1, (\hat{\sigma}_i^j)_2\}$ be the global sections of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{\mathcal{V}})$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$ and $i = 1, 2$, and $\mathbf{t}$ denote points $(t_{11}, \cdots, t_{1m_1}, t_{21}, \cdots, t_{2m_2})$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m_1+m_2}$. Then it may be proved that for generic small $\mathbf{t}$ the section $\Psi^{\mathbf{t}} = \{(\Psi^{\mathbf{t}})_1, (\Psi^{\mathbf{t}})_2, (\Psi^{\mathbf{t}})_{12}\}$ is transversal to the zero section. That is, the following three sections are transversal to the zero section,

$$\Psi_{12}^{\mathbf{t}} : \widehat{V}_{12} \to \widehat{F}_{12},\ \hat{x} \mapsto \widehat{S}_{12}(\hat{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} t_{1j}(\hat{\sigma}_1^j)_{12}(\hat{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} t_{2j}(\hat{\sigma}_2^j)_{12}(\hat{x})$$

$$\Psi_1^{\mathbf{t}} : \widehat{V}_1 \to \widehat{F}_1,\ \hat{x} \mapsto \widehat{S}_1(\hat{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} t_{1j}(\hat{\sigma}_1^j)_1(\hat{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} t_{2j}(\hat{\sigma}_2^j)_1(\hat{x})$$

$$\Psi_2^{\mathbf{t}} : \widehat{V}_2 \to \widehat{F}_2,\ \hat{x} \mapsto \widehat{S}_2(\hat{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} t_{1j}(\hat{\sigma}_1^j)_2(\hat{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} t_{2j}(\hat{\sigma}_2^j)_2(\hat{x}).$$

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_1 = (\Psi^{\mathbf{t}}_1)^{-1}(0)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_2 = (\Psi^{\mathbf{t}}_2)^{-1}(0)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{12} = (\Psi^{\mathbf{t}}_{12})^{-1}(0)$. They are all smooth manifolds of dimension r. Denote by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}\circ}_{12} := \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{12} \cap \widehat{V}^{\circ}_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}\circ}_{i} := \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{i} \cap \widehat{V}^{\circ}_{i},\ i = 1,2.$$

Here $\widehat{V}^{\circ}_{12} = \widehat{V}_{12} \cap \widehat{W}^{\circ}_{12}$ and $\widehat{V}^{\circ}_{i} = \widehat{V}_{i} \cap \widehat{W}^{\circ}_{i}$, $i = 1,2$. Then the maps

$$\hat{\pi}^{12}_i : (\hat{\pi}^{12}_i)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}\circ}_i\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^{12}_i) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}\circ}_i$$

are

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{2}(\sharp\Gamma_i - \sharp\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i) + 1)}{\sharp\Gamma_i - \sharp\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i) + 1} - \text{fold (regular) coverings},\ i = 1,2.$$

Assume that X has at least codimension 2 singularity near $Z(S)$ and $Z(S) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$. Then the formal sum

$$\begin{aligned} e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} :\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{1}{\sharp\Gamma_i - \sharp\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i) + 1} \big\{\hat{\pi}_i : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}\circ}_i \to X\big\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{2}(\sharp\Gamma_i - \sharp\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i) + 1)} \big\{\hat{\pi}_{12} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}\circ}_{12} \to X\big\} \end{aligned}$$

represents a rational singular cycle in X of dimension r, where we only count once on the overlaps in the summation of the singular maps above. The homology class of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, $e(E,S) = [e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}] \in H_r(X, \mathbb{Q})$ is called the **virtual Euler class** of the Banach Fredholm orbibundle (E, X, S). We can prove that this class is independent all related choices. If $r = 0$ one may get a well-defined rational number $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, called **virtual Euler characteristic** of (E, X, S). In particular, when X is an orbifold of finite dimension and E is its tangent bundle it is simply called the **orbifold Euler characteristic of X** (i.e. the Euler characteristic of X as an orbifold).

Example 2.15 *Calculating the orbifold Euler characteristic of a football orbifold:* It is a weighted projective space. Let $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2)$ be a pair of positive integers with highest common divisor 1, and $q_1, q_2 > 1$. The weighted (or twisted) projective space of $\mathbf{q}$ is defined by

$$\mathbb{C}P^1(\mathbf{q}) = (\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\})/\mathbb{C}^*,$$

where $\mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ acts by $\alpha \cdot \mathbf{z} = (\alpha^{q_1} z_1, \alpha^{q_2} z_2)$ for $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$. The $\mathbb{C}^*$-action above is free iff $q_1 = q_2 = 1$. $\mathbb{C}P^1(\mathbf{q})$ has only isolated orbifold singularities. Let $[\mathbf{z}]_{\mathbf{q}}$ denote the orbit of $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ under the above $\mathbb{C}^*$-action. It is a point in $\mathbb{C}P^1(\mathbf{q})$. Clearly, $X = \mathbb{C}P^1(\mathbf{q})$ has two cone singularities, one of type q_1 (the north pole p_N) and another of type q_2 (the south pole p_S). The orbifold structure group Γ_{q_1} at $p_N = [1, 0]_{\mathbf{q}}$ (resp. Γ_{q_2} at $p_S = [0, 1]_{\mathbf{q}}$) is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z}$). Other points are all smooth points. Thus X is an effective orbifold and 2-regular. (Topologically, it is a 2-sphere.) It can be covered by two open disks, W_1

containing p_N and W_2 containing p_S, that intersect in an open annulus W_{12}. Then $\pi_1 : \widetilde{W}_1 \to W_1$ (resp. $\pi_2 : \widetilde{W}_2 \to W_2$) is given by in polar coordinates (r, θ) by $(r, \theta) \mapsto (r, q_1\theta)$ (resp. (s, ϕ) by $(s, \phi) \mapsto (s, q_2\phi)$). $\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z}$) acts on $\widetilde{W}_1$ (resp. $\widetilde{W}_2$) by $(r, \theta) \mapsto (r, \theta + i/q_1)$, $i = 0, \cdots, q_1 - 1$ (resp. $(s, \phi) \mapsto (s, \phi + j/q_2)$, $j = 0, \cdots, q_2 - 1$). Here $\theta, \phi \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Choose smaller discs V_1, V_2 in W_1, W_2 respectively. Assume that the annulus V_{12} is given by $\{(t, \theta) : t \in (1, 4), \theta \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}\}$ in the polar coordinate in W_1, and that

$$V_1 \cap V_{12} = (1, 2) \times S^1 \quad \text{and} \quad V_2 \cap V_{12} = (3, 4) \times S^1.$$

The tangent bundle $\widetilde{E}_1 = T\widetilde{W}_1 \to \widetilde{W}_1$ (resp. $\widetilde{E}_2 = T\widetilde{W}_2 \to \widetilde{W}_2$) can be trivialised away from p_N (resp. p_S) by the vector fields $\tilde{\partial}_r, \tilde{\partial}_\theta$ (resp. $\tilde{\partial}_s, \tilde{\partial}_\phi$) which are Γ_{q_1} (resp. Γ_{q_2}) invariant. So $\tilde{\partial}_r, \tilde{\partial}_\theta$ (resp. $\tilde{\partial}_s, \tilde{\partial}_\phi$) descend to sections $\partial_r, \partial_\theta$ of $E_1 \to W_1 \setminus \{p_N\}$ (resp. $\partial_s, \partial_\phi$ of $E_2 \to W_2 \setminus \{p_S\}$). On the overlap, $\partial_r = -\partial_\theta$ and $\partial_s = -\partial_\phi$. Let $\tilde{\sigma}_1 : \widetilde{W}_1 \to \widetilde{E}_1$ (resp. $\tilde{\sigma}_2 : \widetilde{W}_2 \to \widetilde{E}_2$) be a section of the form $\beta_1(r)\tilde{\partial}_r$ (resp. $\beta_2(s)\tilde{\partial}_s$) where the function $\beta_1 \le 0$ (resp. $\beta_2 \ge 0$) has an isolated zero at $r = 0$ (resp. $s = 0$). Then the section

$$\hat{\sigma} = \{(\hat{\sigma}_1)_1 + (\hat{\sigma}_2)_1, (\hat{\sigma}_1)_2 + (\hat{\sigma}_2)_2, (\hat{\sigma}_1)_{12} + (\hat{\sigma}_2)_{12}\}$$

has only zeros p_N and p_S (we here have identified p_N (resp. p_S) with the unique point in $\hat{\pi}_1^{-1}(p_N)$ (resp. $\hat{\pi}_2^{-1}(p_S)$)). Note that both p_N and p_S are regular. However, by slightly perturbing $\hat{\sigma}$ near p_N and p_S we can achieve transversality, and in this case there is a zero near p_N (resp. near p_S) that counts with weight $1/q_1$ (resp. $1/q_2$). Hence the orbifold Euler characteristic of this orbifold is $\frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$. The reader may refer to [Mc1] for more details and examples.

2.3 The resolutions of Banach orbibundles near a compact subset

It is a key step of Liu-Tian's method in [LiuT1]-[LiuT3] to resolve a Banach orbibundle near a compact subset of its base space. We shall presently give a detailed exposition of this construction; see also [Lu3]. For the sake of simplicity we **always assume that X is 1-regular and effective** without special statements. (Actually, for a Banach Fredholm orbibundle (X, E, S) with compact zero locus $Z(S)$ the condition that X is 1-regular can be weaken to the requirement that X is 1-regular near any $x \in Z(S)$ because we can deduce that an open neighborhood of $Z(S)$ in X is a 1-regular Banach orbifold.) In Remark 2.49 we shall point out how to change the arguments and results when the effectiveness assumption of X is moved.

2.3.1 A general resolution

Let $p : E \to X$ be a Banach orbibundle and $K \subset X$ be a compact subset. For each $x \in K$ let $(\widetilde{W}_x, \Gamma_x, \pi_x)$ be a Banach orbifold chart around it. (**This**

chart can be required to be centered at x if necessary). Since K is compact we may choose finitely many points $x_i \in K$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ (we assume $n > 2$ because of the arguments in §2.2) and corresponding Banach orbifold charts $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ around them on X, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that their supports $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfy:

$$K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n W_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcap_{i=1}^n W_i = \emptyset. \tag{2.8}$$

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all finite subsets $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$ of $\{1, \cdots, n\}$ such that the **intersection** $W_I := \cap_{i \in I} W_i$ is nonempty. Then each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ has the length $|I| = \sharp(I) < n$. For $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ we may always assume $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$. Denote by the group $\Gamma_I := \prod_{l=1}^k \Gamma_{i_l}$ and the **fiber product**

$$\widetilde{W}_I = \Big\{ (\tilde{u}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{u}_{i_k}) \in \prod_{l=1}^k \widetilde{W}_{i_l} \;\big|\; \pi_i(\tilde{u}_i) = \pi_j(\tilde{u}_j) \, \forall i, j \in I \Big\} \tag{2.9}$$

equipped with the induced topology from $\prod_{l=1}^k \widetilde{W}_{i_l}$. Then the obvious **projection**

$$\pi_I : \widetilde{W}_I \to W_I, \; (\tilde{u}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{u}_{i_k}) \mapsto \pi_{i_1}(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) = \cdots = \pi_{i_k}(\tilde{u}_{i_k}), \tag{2.10}$$

has **covering group** Γ_I whose action on $\widetilde{W}_I$ is given by

$$\phi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_i)_{i \in I} = (\phi_i \cdot \tilde{u}_i)_{i \in I}, \quad \forall \phi_I = (\phi_i)_{i \in I} \in \Gamma_I. \tag{2.11}$$

(Hereafter we often write $(\tilde{v}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{v}_{i_k})$ as $(\tilde{v}_i)_{i \in I}$.) Namely, π_I induces a **homeomorphism** from $\widetilde{W}_I / \Gamma_I$ onto W_I. Note that π_I is always proper.

Claim 2.16 *The action of Γ_I on $\widetilde{W}_I$ in (2.11) is effective.*

Indeed, since each $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ is 1-regular it follows from Claim 2.5 that the nonsingular set $\widetilde{W}_i^\circ$ is a dense open subset in $\widetilde{W}_i$. Let

$$\widetilde{W}_I^\circ := \{\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I \,|\, \Gamma_I(\tilde{u}_I) = \{\mathbb{1}\}\} \quad \text{and} \quad W_I^\circ := \pi_I(\widetilde{W}_I^\circ), \tag{2.12}$$

where $\Gamma_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ is the isotopy subgroup of Γ_I at $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$. Then $\widetilde{W}_I^\circ = \pi_{i_1}^{-1}(W_I^\circ) \times \cdots \times \pi_{i_k}^{-1}(W_I^\circ)$ is a dense open subset in $\widetilde{W}_I$. Moreover, $W_I^\circ = \cap_{i \in I} \pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i^\circ) \cap W_I$ is also a dense open subset in W_I. Note that

$$\widetilde{W}_I = \pi_{i_1}^{-1}(W_I) \times \cdots \times \pi_{i_k}^{-1}(W_I)$$

and that $g_s \tilde{y} \neq \tilde{y}$ for any $y \in \pi_{i_s}^{-1}(W_I^\circ)$ and $g_s \in \Gamma_{i_s} \setminus \{\mathbb{1}\}$, $s = 1, \cdots, k$. Then for any $\phi \in \Gamma_I \setminus \{\mathbb{1}\}$ and $(\tilde{u}_i)_{i \in I} \in \widetilde{W}_I^\circ$ it holds that $\phi \cdot (\tilde{u}_i)_{i \in I} \neq (\tilde{u}_i)_{i \in I}$. Claim 2.16 is proved.

Remark 2.17 As pointed out at the beginning of this section, the regular set X° in an effective orbifold of finite dimension is always an open, dense subset in X. So the proof of Claim 2.16 and thus all arguments till the end of Subsection 2.5 are still true even if X is not 1-regular. However, for an effective orbifold of infinite dimension we need the 1-regularity of X to complete the proof of Claim 2.16. Moreover, **if we do not assume that X is effective and do not make the arguments in the effective category, Claim 2.16 is not needed.** See Remark 2.49.

Actually, we can give a precise description for singularities of $\widetilde{W}_I$ locally. For each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ we also denote by

$$\widetilde{W}_I^{sing} := \{\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I \,|\, \Gamma_I(\tilde{u}_I) \neq \{\mathbb{1}\}\} \text{ and } W_I^{sing} := \pi_I(\widetilde{W}_I^{sing}). \tag{2.13}$$

Clearly, they are relatively closed subsets in $\widetilde{W}_I$ and W_I respectively. For any $u \in W_I^{sing}$ and $\tilde{u}_I = (\tilde{u}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{u}_{i_k}) \in \pi_I^{-1}(u) \subset \widetilde{W}_I$, as in the arguments above (2.1) there exists a $\Gamma_{i_1}(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$-equivariant diffeomorphism F from a small neighborhood $N(0_{\tilde{u}_{i_1}})$ of the origin in $T_{\tilde{u}_{i_1}}\widetilde{W}_{i_1}$ onto a neighborhood of $\tilde{u}_{i_1}$ in $\widetilde{W}_{i_1}$, $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) = F(N(0_{\tilde{u}_{i_1}}))$, such that

$$\mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_{i_1})^{sing} := \pi_{i_1}^{-1}(W_I^{sing}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) = \bigcup_{g \in \Gamma_{i_1}(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) \setminus \{\mathbb{1}\}} F\big(N(0_{\tilde{u}_{i_1}}) \cap \nu(dg(\tilde{u}_{i_1}))\big).$$

By Lemma 2.4, by shrinking $N(0_{\tilde{u}_{i_1}})$ if necessary we can find group isomorphisms $\mathcal{A}_{i_1 i_s} : \Gamma_{i_1}(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) \to \Gamma_{i_s}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and diffeomorphisms $\lambda_{i_1 i_s} : \mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) \to \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ that map $\tilde{u}_{i_1}$ to $\tilde{u}_{i_s}$, and such that $\lambda_{i_1 i_s} \circ \phi = \mathcal{A}_{i_1 i_s}(\phi) \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_s}$ for any $\phi \in \Gamma_{i_1}(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$ and $1 < s \leq k$. It follows that

$$\widetilde{W}_I^{sing} \cap \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\Big) = \Big\{(\tilde{x}, \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})) \;\Big|\; \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_{i_1})^{sing}\Big\}.$$

For any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ there are also projections

$$\left.\begin{array}{ll} \pi_J^I : \widetilde{W}_I \to \widetilde{W}_J, & (\tilde{u}_i)_{i \in I} \mapsto (\tilde{u}_j)_{j \in J}, \\ \lambda_J^I : \Gamma_I \to \Gamma_J, & (\phi_i)_{i \in I} \mapsto (\phi_j)_{j \in J}. \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.14}$$

Later we also write λ_J^I as λ_J^i if $I = \{i\}$. Note that π_J^I **is not surjective in general.** To see this point let us consider the case $I = \{1, 2\}$ and $J = \{1\}$. Then $\widetilde{W}_I = \{(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \in \widetilde{W}_1 \times \widetilde{W}_2 \,|\, \pi_1(\tilde{u}_1) = \pi_2(\tilde{u}_2)\}$. Assume that $\pi_J^I : \widetilde{W}_I \to \widetilde{W}_J$ is surjective. For each $\tilde{u}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_J = \widetilde{W}_1$ there exists $\tilde{u}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_2$ such that $(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \in \widetilde{W}_I$ and $\pi_J^I((\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)) = \tilde{u}_1$. It follows that $u_1 = \pi_1(\tilde{u}_1) = \pi_2(\tilde{u}_2) = u_2 \in W_2$. That is, $W_1 \subset W_2$. Clearly, it must not hold in general.

For any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$, by the definition one easily checks that $\widetilde{W}_I^{\circ} = (\pi_J^I)^{-1}\big(\mathrm{Im}(\pi_J^I) \cap \widetilde{W}_J^{\circ}\big)$. These imply that for every $u_I \in W_I^{\circ} = \pi_I(\widetilde{W}_I^{\circ}) \subset W_J^{\circ}$ the inverse image $\pi_I^{-1}(u_I)$ (resp. $\pi_J^{-1}(u_I)$) exactly contains $|\Gamma_I|$ (resp. $|\Gamma_J|$) points. So for each $\tilde{u}_J \in \widetilde{W}_J^{\circ} \cap \mathrm{Im}(\pi_J^I)$ the inverse image $(\pi_J^I)^{-1}(\tilde{u}_J)$ has exactly $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$ points. If $(\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i)(= (\widetilde{E}_i, \widetilde{\Gamma}_i, \Pi_i))$ are the Banach orbibundle charts on E corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Repeating the same construction from $\widetilde{E}_i$ one obtains the similar projections $\Pi_I : \widetilde{E}_I \to E_I$ and $\Pi_J^I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{E}_J$ for $J \subset I$. In summary we get:

Proposition 2.18 *For any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ the projections π_I, λ^I_J and π^I_J, and Π_I and Π^I_J satisfy:*

(i) $\pi_J \circ \pi^I_J = \iota^W_{IJ} \circ \pi_I$ *(on $(\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widetilde{W}_J)$) for the inclusion $\iota^W_{IJ} : W_I \hookrightarrow W_J$.*

(ii) $\pi^I_J \circ \phi_I = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) \circ \pi^I_J$ *for any $\phi_I \in \Gamma_I$.*

(iii) *π_I induces an homeomorphism from the quotient $\widetilde{W}_I/\Gamma_I$ to W_I, and the restriction of π_I to $\widetilde{W}^\circ_I$ is a $|\Gamma_I|$-fold covering of W°_I.*

(iv) *The generic fiber of π^I_J contains $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J| = |\prod_{i\in I\setminus J}\Gamma_i|$ points. Precisely, for each $\tilde{u}_J \in \mathrm{Im}(\pi^I_J) \cap \widetilde{W}^\circ_J$ the inverse image $(\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\tilde{u}_J) \subset \widetilde{W}^\circ_J$ exactly contains $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$ points.*

(v) $\Pi_J \circ \Pi^I_J = \iota^E_{IJ} \circ \Pi_I$ *for the inclusion $\iota^E_{IJ} : E_I \hookrightarrow E_J$.*

(vi) $\Pi^I_J \circ \phi_I = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) \circ \Pi^I_J$ *for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $\phi_I \in \Gamma_I$.*

(vii) *The obvious projection $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{W}_I$ is equivariant with respect to the induced actions of Γ_I on them, i.e. $\tilde{p}_I \circ \psi_I = \psi_I \circ \tilde{p}_I$ for any $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$.*

(viii) $\pi_I \circ \tilde{p}_I = p \circ \Pi_I$ *for any $\phi_I \in \Gamma_I$, and $\pi^I_J \circ \tilde{p}_I = \tilde{p}_J \circ \Pi^I_J$ for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$.*

(ix) *The generic fiber of Π^I_J contains $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$ points.*

However, as showed in Lemma 2.19 below the projection $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{W}_I$ is not Banach vector bundle if $|I| > 1$; accordingly we instead temporarily call it the **the virtual Banach vector bundle**. Therefore we get a system of virtual Banach bundles

$$\big(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widetilde{W}(K)\big) = \big\{(\widetilde{E}_I, \widetilde{W}_I), \pi_I, \Pi_I, \Gamma_I, \pi^I_J, \Pi^I_J, \lambda^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}. \quad (2.15)$$

Lemma 2.19 *For each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| > 1$, $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{W}_I$ is a Banach bundle variety in the sense that locally $\widetilde{W}_I$ is a finite union of Banach manifolds and the restriction of $\widetilde{E}_I$ on each of these finitely many Banach manifolds is a Banach vector bundle.*

Proof. Let $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $k > 1$ and $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k$. For a given $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$ and $u_I = \pi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ we choose a small connected open neighborhood of u_I in W_I, O (that is a support of a Banach orbifold chart in $\mathcal{A}$) and consider the inverse image $\widetilde{O}_{i_l} = \pi^{-1}_{i_l}(O)$ of O in $\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$, $l = 1, \cdots, k$. Then each $\widetilde{O}_{i_l}$ is an open neighborhood of $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$ in $\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$, and the isotropy subgroup $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ of Γ_{i_l} at $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$ acts on $\widetilde{O}_{i_l}$. (To see the second claim, for any $\phi \in \Gamma_{i_l}$ and $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{O}_{i_l}$ we have $\phi(\tilde{x}) \in \widetilde{W}_{i_l}$. So it follows from $\pi_{i_l}(\phi(\tilde{x})) = \pi_{i_l}(\tilde{x}) \in O$ that $\phi(\tilde{x}) \in \widetilde{O}_{i_l}$.) If O is small enough, for any fix $s \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$ it follows from Lemma 2.4 that there exist diffeomorphisms $\lambda_{i_s i_l} : \widetilde{O}_{i_s} \to \widetilde{O}_{i_l}$ that map $\tilde{u}_{i_s}$ to $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$, and group isomorphisms $\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l} : \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ such that

$$\lambda_{i_s i_l} \circ \phi = \mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l}(\phi) \circ \lambda_{i_s i_l} \quad (2.16)$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $l \in \{1, \cdots, k\} \setminus \{s\}$. Those diffeomorphisms $\lambda_{i_s i_l}$ ($s \neq l$) in (2.16) are unique up to composition with elements in $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and

$\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$. Namely, if we have another diffeomorphism $\lambda'_{i_s i_l}: \widetilde{O}_{i_s} \to \widetilde{O}_{i_l}$ that maps $\tilde{u}_{i_s}$ to $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$, and the group isomorphism $\mathcal{A}'_{i_s i_l}: \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ such that

$$\lambda'_{i_s i_l} \circ \phi = \mathcal{A}'_{i_s i_l}(\phi) \circ \lambda'_{i_s i_l} \tag{2.17}$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$, then there exist corresponding $\phi_{i_s} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $\phi_{i_l} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ such that

$$\lambda_{i_s i_l} = \phi_{i_l} \circ \lambda'_{i_s i_l} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{i_s i_l} = \lambda'_{i_s i_l} \circ \phi_{i_s}. \tag{2.18}$$

In particular these imply that

$$\lambda_{i_l i_s} \circ \lambda_{i_s i_l} = \phi_{i_s} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{i_t i_s} \circ \lambda_{i_l i_t} \circ \lambda_{i_s i_l} = \phi'_{i_s}. \tag{2.19}$$

for some $\phi_{i_s}, \phi'_{i_s} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$, $s \neq l, t$ and $l \neq t$. For convenience we make the **convention**: $\lambda_{i_s i_s} = id_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_s} = 1_{\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}$. Then we have $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ smooth open embeddings from $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$ into $\widetilde{W}_I$ given by

$$\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I : \tilde{x}_s \mapsto \big(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{x}_s)\big)_{i \in I}, \tag{2.20}$$

where $\lambda^s_I = (\lambda_{i_s i})_{i \in I}$ with $\lambda_{i_s i_s} = id_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}$, and $\phi_I = (\phi_i)_{i \in I}$ belongs to

$$\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s := \Big\{(\phi_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{l=1}^{k} \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l}) \;\Big|\; \phi_{i_s} = 1\Big\}. \tag{2.21}$$

Hereafter saying $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I$ to be a smooth open embedding from $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$ into $\widetilde{W}_I$ means that $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I$ is a smooth embedding from $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$ into the Banach manifold $\widetilde{W}_{i_1} \times \cdots \times \widetilde{W}_{i_k}$ and that the image $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ is an open subset in $\widetilde{W}_I$.

Clearly, $(\tilde{x}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{x}_{i_k}) \in \prod_{l=1}^k \widetilde{O}_{i_l} \subset \prod_{l=1}^k \widetilde{W}_{i_l}$ is contained in $\widetilde{W}_I$ if and only if

$$(\tilde{x}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{x}_{i_k}) = \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\tilde{x}_{i_s})$$

for some $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$. So the neighborhood

$$\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I) := \pi_I^{-1}(O) = \Big(\prod_{l=1}^{k} \widetilde{O}_{i_l}\Big) \cap \widetilde{W}_I \tag{2.22}$$

of $\tilde{u}_I$ in $\widetilde{W}_I$ can be identified with an union of $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ copies of $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$,

$$\bigcup_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s} \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}). \tag{2.23}$$

Furthermore, for any two different ϕ_I, ϕ'_I in $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \cap \phi'_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) = \big\{&(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{v}))_{i \in I} \;\big|\; \tilde{v} \in \widetilde{O}_{i_s} \;\& \\ &(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{v}))_{i \in I} = (\phi'_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{v}))_{i \in I}\big\} \supseteq \{\tilde{u}_I\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

In order to show that $\widetilde{W}_I$ is a Banach variety, we need to prove that those $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ sets, $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$, $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$, are intrinsic in the following sense that

$$\big\{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \;\big|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\} = \big\{\phi_I \circ \lambda^t_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_t}) \;\big|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_t\big\} \tag{2.25}$$

for any two s,t in $\{1,\cdots,k\}$. For simplicity we only prove it for the case that $k=3$ and $s=1,t=2$. Note that we may identify $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1$ (resp. $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_2$) with $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_2})\times\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_3})$ (resp. $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_1})\times\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_3})$). Then each set in $\{\phi_I\circ\lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1\}$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&(\phi_{i_2}\times\phi_{i_3})\circ\lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}):=\\&\big\{\big(\tilde{x}_{i_1},\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde{x}_{i_1}),\phi_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_3}(\tilde{x}_{i_1})\big)\;\big|\;\tilde{x}_{i_1}\in\widetilde{O}_{i_1}\big\}\end{aligned}$$

for some $\phi_{i_2}\times\phi_{i_3}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_2})\times\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_3})$. Similarly, each set in $\{\phi_I\circ\lambda^2_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_2})\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_2\}$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&(\phi'_{i_1}\times\phi'_{i_3})\circ\lambda^2_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_2}):=\\&\big\{\big(\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2}),\tilde{x}_{i_2},\phi'_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_3}(\tilde{x}_{i_2})\big)\;\big|\;\tilde{x}_{i_2}\in\widetilde{O}_{i_2}\big\}\end{aligned}$$

for some $\phi'_{i_1}\times\phi'_{i_3}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_1})\times\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_3})$. Thus in the present case the proof of (2.25) is reduced to finding $\phi'_{i_1}\times\phi'_{i_3}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_1})\times\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_3})$ for given $\phi_{i_2}\times\phi_{i_3}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_2})\times\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_3})$ such that

$$(\phi_{i_2}\times\phi_{i_3})\circ\lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})=(\phi'_{i_1}\times\phi'_{i_3})\circ\lambda^2_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_2}).\tag{2.26}$$

For any $\phi'_{i_1}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$, since $\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}:\widetilde{O}_{i_2}\to\widetilde{O}_{i_1}$ is a diffeomorphism it is easily checked that the set

$$\begin{aligned}&(\phi_{i_2}\times\phi_{i_3})\circ\lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})\\&=\big\{\big(\tilde{x}_{i_1},\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde{x}_{i_1}),\phi_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_3}(\tilde{x}_{i_1})\big)\;\big|\;\tilde{x}_{i_1}\in\widetilde{O}_{i_1}\big\}\end{aligned}$$

is equal to that of all triples

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2}),\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2})),\phi_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_3}(\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2}))\big)\\&=\big(\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2}),\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}\circ\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2}),\phi_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_3}\circ\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{x}_{i_2})\big),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{x}_{i_2}$ takes over $\widetilde{O}_{i_2}$. By (2.17), (2.18) and (2.19) we may obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}\circ\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}&=\phi_{i_2}\circ\mathcal{A}_{i_1i_2}(\phi'_{i_1})\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}\\&=\phi_{i_2}\circ\mathcal{A}_{i_1i_2}(\phi'_{i_1})\circ\phi''_{i_2}\end{aligned}$$

for some $\phi''_{i_2}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_2})$, and that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_3}\circ\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}&=\phi_{i_3}\circ\mathcal{A}_{i_1i_3}(\phi'_{i_1})\circ\lambda_{i_1i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}\\&=\phi_{i_2}\circ\mathcal{A}_{i_1i_2}(\phi'_{i_1})\circ\phi'''_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_3}\end{aligned}$$

for some $\phi'''_{i_2}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_2})$. Hence (2.26) holds if we take

$$\phi'_{i_3}=\phi_{i_2}\circ\mathcal{A}_{i_1i_2}(\phi'_{i_1})\circ\phi'''_{i_2}\quad\text{and}\quad\phi'_{i_1}=\mathcal{A}^{-1}_{i_1i_2}(\phi^{-1}_{i_2}\circ(\phi''_{i_2})^{-1}).$$

Similarly, (by shrinking O if necessary) using the properties of orbibundles one has also smooth bundle isomorphisms

$$\Lambda_{i_si_l}:\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}\to\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}$$

covering $\lambda_{i_si_l}$, i.e. $\lambda_{i_si_l}\cdot\tilde{p}_{i_s}=\tilde{p}_{i_l}\cdot\Lambda_{i_si_l}$, such that

$$\Lambda_{i_si_l}\circ\Phi=\boxed{\mathcal{A}_{i_si_l}(\phi)}\circ\Lambda_{i_si_l}$$

for any $\phi\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $l\in\{1,\cdots,k\}\setminus\{s\}$. Hereafter

$$\Phi:\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}\to\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}\ \big(\text{resp. }\boxed{\mathcal{A}_{i_si_l}(\phi)}:\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}\to\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}\big)\tag{2.27}$$

is the bundle isomorphism lifting of ϕ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{i_si_l}(\phi)$) produced in the definition of orbifold bundles. (**As stated in Remark 2.8 we hereafter write** $(\widetilde{E}_{i_l},\widetilde{\Gamma}_{i_l},\Pi_{i_l})$ **as** $(\widetilde{E}_{i_l},\Gamma_{i_l},\Pi_{i_l})$ **and understand** $\phi_{i_l}\in\Gamma_{i_l}$ **to acts on** $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}$ **via** $\phi_{i_l}\cdot\tilde{\xi}=\Phi_{i_l}(\tilde{\xi})$ **with** $\Phi_{i_l}=\lambda_{W_{i_l}}(\phi_{i_l})$ **and** $\tilde{\xi}\in\widetilde{E}_{i_l}$.) It is easy to see that Φ_{i_l} maps $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}$ to $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}$. In particular the restriction of it to $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}$ is also a smooth bundle automorphism of $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}$ covering $\phi_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}}$, and is still denoted by Φ_{i_l}. So for the above $\lambda^s_I=(\lambda_{i_si})_{i\in I}$ with $\lambda_{i_si_s}=id_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}$, and $\phi_I=(\phi_i)_{i\in I}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ we get the corresponding

$$\Phi_I:=(\Phi_i)_{i\in I}\quad\text{and}\quad\Lambda^s_I:=(\Lambda_{i_si})_{i\in I},\tag{2.28}$$

where we have made the **convention**:

$$\Phi_{i_s}=1\quad\text{and}\quad\Lambda_{i_si_s}=id_{\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}}.$$

Corresponding with (2.20) we obtain $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ smooth bundle open embeddings

$$\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I:\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}\to\widetilde{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_si}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\tag{2.29}$$

for $\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$. Here "smooth bundle open embedding" is to be understood in a similar way as is explained below (2.21). Clearly, each map

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}})\to\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}),\\&\big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_si}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\mapsto\big(\phi_i\circ\lambda_{i_si}(\tilde{p}_{i_s}(\tilde{\xi}))\big)_{i\in I}\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

is a Banach vector bundle over the Banach manifold $\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$, and

$$\bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}})=\widetilde{E}_I\Big|_{\bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})}.$$

Corresponding with (2.23) and (2.24) we have also:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}})\bigcap\Phi'_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}})=\\&\big\{\big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_si}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\;\big|\;\tilde{\xi}\in\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}\ \&\ \big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_si}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}=\big(\Phi'_i\circ\Lambda_{i_si}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

for any two different ϕ_I,ψ_I in $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$, and

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\big\{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}})\;\big|\;\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\}\\=\big\{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^t_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_t}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_t}})\;\big|\;\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_t\big\}\end{array}\right\}\tag{2.31}$$

for any $s,t\in\{1,\cdots,k\}$. Hence $\widetilde{E}_I\to\widetilde{W}_I$ is a Banach bundle variety. □

Remark 2.20 By shrinking O we may also assume that each $\lambda_{i_s i_l}$ in (2.16) is not only a diffeomorphism from $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$ to $\widetilde{O}_{i_l}$, but also one from a neighborhood of the closure of $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$ to that of $\widetilde{O}_{i_l}$. In this case the union in (2.23) may be required to satisfy:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \text{If } \tilde{v}\in \bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \text{ and } \tilde{v}\notin \phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\\ \text{for some}\, t, \text{ then } \tilde{v}\notin Cl\big(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\big). \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.32}$$

It means that each $\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})$ is relatively closed in $\bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$. Let us prove (2.32) by contradiction arguments. Suppose that $\tilde{v}\in Cl\big(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\big)\setminus\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})$. Since $Cl\big(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\big)=\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(Cl(\widetilde{O}_{i_t}))$ there exists a unique $\tilde{x}\in Cl(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})$, which must sit in $Cl(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\setminus\widetilde{O}_{i_t}$, such that $\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\tilde{x})=\tilde{v}$. Moreover, since $\tilde{v}$ belongs to some $\phi'_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ one has a unique $\tilde{y}\in\widetilde{O}_{i_s}$ such that $\phi'_i\circ\lambda_I^s(\tilde{y})=\tilde{v}$. So $\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^t(\tilde{x})=\phi'_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\tilde{y})$. For the sake of clearness we assume $t=1$ and $s=2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\tilde{x},\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde{x}),\cdots,\phi_{i_k}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_k}(\tilde{x})\big)\\ &=\big(\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{y}),\tilde{y},\phi'_{i_3}\circ\lambda_{i_3i_1}(\tilde{y}),\cdots,\phi'_{i_k}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_k}(\tilde{x})\big).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\tilde{x}=\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{y})$. Note that $\lambda_{i_2i_1}:\widetilde{O}_{i_2}\to\widetilde{O}_{i_1}$ and $\phi'_{i_1}:\widetilde{O}_{i_1}\to\widetilde{O}_{i_1}$ are both diffeomorphisms. We deduce that $\tilde{x}=\phi'_{i_1}\circ\lambda_{i_2i_1}(\tilde{y})\in\widetilde{O}_{i_1}$. This contradicts that $\tilde{x}\in Cl(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})\setminus\widetilde{O}_{i_1}$. (2.32) is proved.

Similarly, we also require that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \text{If } \tilde{\xi}\in \bigcup_{\Phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \text{ and } \tilde{\xi}\notin \Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\\ \text{for some}\, t, \text{ then } \tilde{\xi}\notin Cl\big(\Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^t(\widetilde{O}_{i_t})\big). \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.33}$$

Later we always assume that (2.32) and (2.33) are satisfied without special statements.

In terms of [LiuT3] we introduce:

Definition 2.21 The family of the smooth embeddings given by (2.20), $\big\{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\}$, is called a **local coordinate chart of $\widetilde{W}_I$ over a neighborhood $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)$ of $\tilde{u}_I$**, and each $\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s$ is called a **component** of this chart. Similarly, we call the family of the bundle embeddings given by (2.29), $\big\{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^s\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\}$, a **local bundle coordinate chart of $\widetilde{E}_I$ over $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)$**, and each $\Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^s$ a **component** of it. For $\tilde{x}_I\in\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$, a connected relative open subset $W\subset\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ containing $\tilde{x}_I$ is called a **local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{x}_I$**. In particular, $\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{u}_I$. The restriction of $\Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^s(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}})$ to a local component near $\tilde{u}_I$ is called a **local component of $\widetilde{E}_I$ near $\tilde{u}_I$**. Two local components of $\widetilde{W}_I$ (or $\widetilde{E}_I$) near a point $\tilde{u}$ of $\widetilde{W}_I$ are said to be of **different kind** if the intersection of both is not a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{u}$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a family of local components of different kind near a point $\tilde{u}\in\widetilde{W}_I$. If the union of sets in $\mathcal{A}$ forms an open neighborhood $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{u})$ of $\tilde{u}$ in $\widetilde{W}_I$ we call **$\mathcal{A}$ a complete family of local components of $\widetilde{W}_I$ over $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{u})$**. Clearly, we have also a notion of germ of complete families of local components.

Note that (2.25) and (2.31) show that one can construct the same complete families of local components starting from two different s and t. Moreover, suppose that $Q \subset O$ is another small open neighborhood of u_I in W_I. Then all constructions in the proof of Lemma 2.19 work as we replace O with Q, and the corresponding local components of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{u}_I$ and those of $\widetilde{E}_I$ near $(\widetilde{E}_I)_{\tilde{u}_I}$ are, respectively, given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{Q}_{i_s}) \;\middle|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\right\} \quad \text{and}\\ &\left\{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^s(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{Q}_{i_s}}) \;\middle|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here $\widetilde{Q}_{i_l} = \pi_{i_l}^{-1}(Q)$ are the inverse images of Q in $\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$, $l = 1, \cdots, k$, and $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s$ and $\Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^s$ as in (2.25) and (2.31). More general conclusions, stated in Lemma 4.3 of [LiuT3], will be:

Proposition 2.22 *The notion of local component is functorial with respect to restriction and projection, that is:*

(i) *If $\{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a local coordinate chart near $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$, then for each point $\tilde{v}_I \in \cup_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s} \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\tilde{v}_I$ in $\widetilde{W}_I$ such that $\{\mathcal{Q} \cap \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a complete family of local components of $\widetilde{W}_I$ over $\mathcal{Q}$.*

(ii) *If $\{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a local coordinate chart near $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$ and $i_s \in J \subset I$, then $\{\pi_J^I \circ \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a local coordinate chart near $\pi_J^I(\tilde{u}_I) \in \widetilde{W}_J$ (after the repeating maps $\pi_J^I \circ \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s$ is only taken one at a time). In particular, not only the projection $\pi_J^I : \widetilde{W}_I \to \widetilde{W}_J$ maps the local component $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ near $\tilde{u}_I$ to the local component $\pi_J^I(\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}))$ near $\pi_J^I(\tilde{u}_I)$ in $\widetilde{W}_J$ but also the restriction*

$$\pi_J^I|_{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})} : \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \to \pi_J^I(\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}))$$

is a smooth map. Actually one has

$$\pi_J^I \circ \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s = \lambda_J^I(\phi_I) \circ \lambda_J^s = \phi_J \circ \lambda_J^s,$$

where $\lambda_J^s = (\lambda_{i_s l})_{l \in J}$.

(iii) *Correspondingly, the projection $\Pi_J^I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{E}_J$ restricts to a smooth bundle map from $\widetilde{E}_I|_{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})}$ to $\widetilde{E}_J|_{\pi_J^I(\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}))}$.*

Proof. (i) By (2.32) we may choose a connected open neighborhood $\mathcal{Q} \subset \pi_I^{-1}(O)$ of $\tilde{v}$ in $\widetilde{W}_I$ such that for any $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$,

$$\mathcal{Q} \cap Cl(\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})) = \emptyset \quad \text{as} \quad \tilde{v}_I \notin \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}).$$

If $v_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ then the connected relative open subset $\mathcal{Q} \cap \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ in $\phi_i \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{v}_I$. It is easy to see that the union of sets in $\{\mathcal{Q} \cap \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is equal to $\mathcal{Q}$. So (i) holds.

(ii) We may assume that $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$ and $J = \{i_1, \cdots, i_{k'}\}$ with $k' < k$. By (2.24) we may also take $s = 1$. Then by (2.21) we have

$$\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1 = \big\{(1, \phi_{i_2}, \cdots, \phi_{i_k}) \bigm| \phi_{i_l} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l}), l = 2, \cdots, k\big\},$$
$$\Gamma(\pi^I_J(\tilde{u}_I))_1 = \big\{(1, \phi_{i_2}, \cdots, \phi_{i_{k'}}) \bigm| \phi_{i_l} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l}), l = 2, \cdots, k'\big\}.$$

That is, $\lambda^I_J(\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1) = \Gamma(\pi^I_J(\tilde{u}_I))_1$. So for a given local component

$$\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) = \big\{\big(\tilde{x}_1, \phi_{i_2} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}_1), \cdots, \phi_{i_k} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x}_1)\big) \bigm| \tilde{x}_1 \in \widetilde{O}_{i_1}\big\}$$

of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{u}_I$, we have a corresponding local component of $\widetilde{W}_J$ near $\pi^I_J(\tilde{u}_I)$ as follow:

$$\phi_J \circ \lambda^1_J(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) = \big\{\big(\tilde{x}_1, \phi_{i_2} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}_1), \cdots, \phi_{i'_k} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_{k'}}(\tilde{x}_1)\big) \bigm| \tilde{x}_1 \in \widetilde{O}_{i_1}\big\}.$$

Here $\phi_J = (1, \phi_{i_2}, \cdots, \phi_{i_{k'}}) = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) \in \Gamma(\pi^I_J(\tilde{u}_I))_1$ and $\lambda^1_J = (\phi_{i_1 l})_{l \in J}$. Clearly, $\pi^I_J \circ \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) \circ \lambda^1_J = \phi_J \circ \lambda^1_J$, and so $\pi^I_J\big(\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})\big) = \phi_J \circ \lambda^1_J(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})$. Moreover the restriction

$$\pi^I_J|_{\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})} : \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \to \phi_J \circ \lambda^1_J(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}),$$

which maps $\big(\tilde{x}_1, \phi_{i_2} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}_1), \cdots, \phi_{i_k} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x}_1)\big)$ to

$$\big(\tilde{x}_1, \phi_{i_2} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}_1), \cdots, \phi_{i_{k'}} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_{k'}}(\tilde{x}_1)\big),$$

is explicitly a smooth map. (ii) is proved. (iii) is also proved easily. □

The arguments below Definition 2.21 and Proposition 2.22 show that the **notion of local component is intrinsic**. Using this, for each $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| > 1$ we can desingularize $\widetilde{W}_I$ to get a true Banach manifold $\widehat{W}_I$. Consider the disjoint union of Banach manifolds

$$\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I} := \coprod_{\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I} \coprod_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1} \coprod_{O \in \mathcal{U}(u_I)} \{(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I)\} \times \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}), \tag{2.34}$$

where $\mathcal{U}(u_I)$ is the germ of small connected open neighborhoods of $u_I = \pi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ in W_I (that are supports of charts in the atlas $\mathcal{A}$) and $\widetilde{O}_{i_1} = \pi^{-1}_{i_1}(O)$. In $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ we define a relation $\sim$ as follows: For $\tilde{u}_I, \tilde{u}'_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$, and $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1$, $\phi'_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}'_I)_1$, and $\tilde{y}_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})$ and $\tilde{y}'_I \in \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})$ we define

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I) \tag{2.35}$$

if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) $\tilde{y}_I = \tilde{y}'_I$ as points in $\widetilde{W}_I$;

(ii) $\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \bigcap \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{y}_I = \tilde{y}'_I$.

By Proposition 2.22 we immediately obtain:

Claim 2.23 *The relation $\sim$ in (2.35) is a* regular equivalence *in* $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$. *Moreover, any two different points in $\{(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I)\} \times \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})$ are not equivalent with respect to $\sim$.*

In [MaOu, Def.4.3.1, Def.4.3.3]) an equivalence relation $\mathcal{R} \subset X \times X$ on a C^k-manifold X is said to be **regular** if there is a C^k-differentiable structure on $X/\mathcal{R}$ such that the projection map $q : X \to X/\mathcal{R}$ is a C^k-submersion. This unique C^k-differentiable structure on $X/\mathcal{R}$ is called **quotient differentiable structure** and the associated manifold is called **quotient manifold** given by $\mathcal{R}$ on X. An equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ on X is said to preserves the boundary if $\mathcal{R}(\partial X) = \partial X$. For the precise relations between ∂X and $X/\mathcal{R}$ the reader may refer to [MaOu, Th.4.3.14]) (and in particular [MaOu, Cor.4.3.15] and [MaOu, Th.4.3.17] in two special cases that $\partial X = \emptyset$ and $\partial(X/\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$).

Proof of Claim 2.23. We only need to prove the regularity. For the sake of simplicity we assume that X and thus $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ have no boundary. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a subset in $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I} \times \boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ determined by the equivalence relation $\sim$. By Corollary 4.3.15 in [MaOu] we need to show that $\mathcal{R}$ is a submanifold of $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I} \times \boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ without boundary and that $P_1|_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathcal{R} \to \boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ is a submersion. Here P_1 is the projection of $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I} \times \boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ to the first factor. Let $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)$ be as in (2.35). Then $\big((\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I), (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)\big)$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}$. Note that for any $\tilde{z}_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \bigcap \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})$ we have

$$\big((\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{z}_I), (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{z}_I)\big) \in \mathcal{R}.$$

So a neighborhood of $\big((\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I), (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)\big)$ in $\mathcal{R}$ can be identified with $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \bigcap \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})$, and in this situation the restriction of $P_1|_{\mathcal{R}}$ to this neighborhood is the identity map. The desired conclusions follow immediately. $\square$

Denote by $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]$ the equivalence class of $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I)$, and by

$$\widehat{W}_I = \boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}\Big/ \sim \tag{2.36}$$

if $|I| > 1$, and by $\widehat{W}_I = \widetilde{W}_i$ if $I = \{i\} \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\widehat{W}_I$ is a Banach manifold, and each

$$\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1} : \widetilde{O}_{i_1} \to \widehat{W}_I,\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x})], \tag{2.37}$$

gives a smooth open embedding (which is called **a local coordinate chart of $\widehat{W}_I$ near** $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{u}_I]$). The projections π_I and π_J^I induce natural ones

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{W}_I \to W_I, \quad [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \mapsto \pi_I(\tilde{y}_I), \\ \hat{\pi}_J^I : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{W}_J,\ [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \mapsto [\tilde{u}_J, \phi_J, \tilde{y}_J] \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.38}$$

Here $\phi_J = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) = (\phi_l)_{l\in J}$, $\tilde{u}_J = \pi^I_J(\tilde{u}_I) = (\tilde{u}_l)_{l\in J}$ and $\tilde{y}_J = \pi^I_J(\tilde{y}_I) = (\tilde{y}_l)_{l\in J}$. By Proposition 2.22(ii) the map $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ is well-defined, and as in the arguments below (2.14) we can show that $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ is not surjective in general if $I \neq J$. Note that in the charts $\widehat{\phi_I\circ\lambda^1_I}$ and

$$\widehat{\phi_J\circ\lambda^1_J} : \widetilde{O}_{j_1} \to \widehat{W}_J,\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\tilde{u}_J, \phi_J, \phi_J\circ\lambda^1_J(\tilde{x})],$$

the projection $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ may be represented by

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_1} \to \widetilde{O}_{j_1},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto \lambda_{i_1 j_1}(\tilde{x}) \tag{2.39}$$

because $j_1 \in J \subset I$. Here $\lambda_{i_1 j_1} = 1_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}$ if $j_1 = i_1$. So $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ **is a smooth map**.

Recall that the action of any $\psi_I = (\psi_l)_{l\in I} \in \Gamma_I$ on

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{y}_I = \phi_I\circ\lambda^1_I(\tilde{x}) &= \big(\tilde{x}, \phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \phi_{i_k}\circ\lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big)\\ &\in \phi_I\circ\lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \subset \widetilde{W}_I\end{aligned}$$

is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_I(\tilde{y}_I) &= \big(\psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x}), \psi_{i_2}\circ\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \psi_{i_k}\circ\phi_{i_k}\circ\lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big)\\ &= \big(\psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x}), \phi^*_{i_2}\circ\lambda^*_{i_1 i_2}(\psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x})), \cdots, \phi^*_{i_k}\circ\lambda^*_{i_1 i_k}(\psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x})\big)\\ &= \phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{1*}_I(\psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x})) \in \phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{1*}_I(\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})).\end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

Here $\phi^*_I = (\phi^*_l)_{l\in I} \in \Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_1$, $\phi^*_l = \psi_l\circ\phi_l\circ\psi_l^{-1}$ for $l \in I$, and $\lambda^{1*}_I = (\lambda^*_{i_1 l})_{l\in I}$, $\lambda^*_{i_1 l} = \psi_l\circ\lambda_{i_1 l}\circ\psi^{-1}_{i_1}$ for any $l \in I$. Let us define

$$\psi_I\cdot(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) = \big(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \psi_I(\tilde{y}_I)\big). \tag{2.41}$$

Then it is easily checked that (2.41) gives a **smooth effective action** of Γ_I on the space $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$. Observe that for each $s \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$ and $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ the above ϕ^*_I belongs to $\Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_s$. Denote by $\lambda^{s*}_I = (\lambda^*_{i_s l})_{l\in I}$, $\lambda^*_{i_s l} = \psi_l\circ\lambda_{i_s l}\circ\psi^{-1}_{i_s}$ for any $l \in I$. Then

$$\phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{s*}_I : \psi_{i_s}(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \to \widetilde{W}_I,\ \tilde{z}_s \mapsto \big(\phi^*_l\circ\lambda^*_{i_s l}(\tilde{z}_s)\big)_{l\in I}$$

is a smooth open embedding, and $\{\phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{s*}_I \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a local coordinate chart of $\widetilde{W}_I$ over the neighborhood $\psi_I\big(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)\big)$ of $\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ in the sense of Definition 2.21. In particular, we get a local coordinate chart of $\widehat{W}_I$ around $[\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \psi_I(\tilde{u}_I)]$,

$$\widehat{\phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{*1}_I} : \psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \to \widehat{W}_I,\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{*1}_I(\tilde{x})]. \tag{2.42}$$

Let $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)$ be as in (2.35). Clearly, $\psi_I(\tilde{y}_I) = \psi_I(\tilde{y}'_I)$ and

$$\phi^*_I\circ\lambda^{1*}_I\big(\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})\big) \bigcap \phi'^*_I\circ\lambda'^{1*}_I\big(\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})\big)$$

is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\psi_I(\tilde{y}_I) = \psi_I(\tilde{y}'_I)$. So we get:

Lemma 2.24 *The action in (2.41) preserves the equivalence relation* $\sim$, *i.e.* $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)$ *if and only if* $\psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)$. *So it induces a natural smooth effective action of* Γ_I *on* $\widehat{W_I}$:

$$\psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] = [\psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I)] \tag{2.43}$$

for any $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$ *and* $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \in \widehat{W_I}$.

Proof. We only need to prove that the action is smooth and effective. Indeed, in the charts in (2.37) and (2.42)

$$[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] = [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\tilde{x})] \mapsto \psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]$$

is given by the smooth map

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_1} \to \psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}), \quad \tilde{x} \mapsto \psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x}).$$

The effectiveness follows from the fact that the action of Γ_I on $\boxed{\widetilde{W_I}}$ is effective. $\square$

Clearly, a continuous surjective map

$$q_I : \widehat{W_I} \to \widetilde{W_I},\ [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \mapsto \tilde{y}_I, \tag{2.44}$$

is smooth as a map from $\widehat{W_I}$ to $\prod_{i\in I} \widetilde{W_i}$ and also satisfies $\pi_I \circ q_I = \hat{\pi}_I$. It follows from (2.41) and (2.43) that q_I commutates with the actions on $\widehat{W_I}$ and $\widetilde{W_I}$, i.e. $q_I(\psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]) = \psi_I \cdot (q_I([\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]))$ for each $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \in \widehat{W_I}$ and $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$. These imply that q_I induces a continuous surjective map $\hat{q}_I$ from $\widehat{W_I}/\Gamma_I$ to $\widetilde{W_I}/\Gamma_I$. In fact, $\hat{q}_I$ **is a homeomorphism, and hence** $\hat{\pi}_I$ **induces a homeomorphism from** $\widehat{W_I}/\Gamma_I$ **to** W_I. To see this let $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \in \widehat{W_I}$, $[\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I] \in \widehat{W_I}$ be such that $\pi_I(\tilde{y}_I) = \pi_I(\tilde{y}'_I)$. We need to prove that there exists $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$ such that $\psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] = [\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I]$. Since $\pi_I(\tilde{y}_I) = \pi_I(\tilde{y}'_I)$ there is $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$ such that $\psi_I(\tilde{y}_I) = \tilde{y}'_I$. Recall that $\tilde{y}_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})$ and $\tilde{y}'_I \in \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})$. By (2.40), $\psi_I(\tilde{y}_I) \in \phi^*_I \circ \lambda^{1*}_I(\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}))$. That is, $\psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] = [\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \psi_I(\tilde{y}_I)]$. Note that the local structure of $\widetilde{W_I}$ near $\tilde{y}_I$ is essentially the same as that of $\widetilde{W_I}$ near $\tilde{y}'_I$. (By composing with a suitable element $\varphi_I \in (\Gamma_I)_{\tilde{y}'_I}$) ψ_I can be chosen so that the intersection $\phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1}) \cap \phi^*_I \circ \lambda^{1*}_I(\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}))$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W_I}$ near $\tilde{y}'_I = \psi_I(\tilde{y}_I)$. Let

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \widehat{W}^\circ_I := \{\hat{u}_I \in \widehat{W_I} \,|\, \Gamma_I(\hat{u}_I) = \{1\}\} \quad \text{and} \\ \widehat{W}^{sing}_I := \{\hat{u}_I \in \widehat{W_I} \,|\, \Gamma_I(\hat{u}_I) \neq \{1\}\} \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.45}$$

where $\Gamma_I(\hat{u}_I)$ is the isotropy subgroup of Γ_I at $\hat{u}_I \in \widehat{W_I}$. Then $\widehat{W}^\circ_I$ is an open and dense subset in $\widehat{W_I}$, and $\widehat{W}^{sing}_I$ is relatively closed in $\widehat{W_I}$. Moreover, $\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{W}^\circ_I)$ and $\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{W}^{sing}_I)$ are equal to W°_I in (2.12) and W^{sing}_I in (2.13) respectively. Summarizing the above arguments we get:

Proposition 2.25 **(i)** $\widehat{W_I}$ *is a Banach manifold and* $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ *is a smooth map.*

(ii) *There exists a smooth effective action of* Γ_I *on* $\widehat{W}_I$ *(given by (2.43)) such that* $\hat\pi_I$ *is invariant under the action and induces a homeomorphism from* $\widehat{W}_I/\Gamma_I$ *to* W_I*.*[2]

(iii) $\hat\pi_J \circ \hat\pi^I_J = \iota^W_{IJ} \circ \hat\pi_I$ *for any* $J \subset I \subset \mathcal{N}$ *and the inclusion* $\iota^W_{IJ} : W_I \hookrightarrow W_J$*.*

(iv) $\hat\pi^I_J \circ \psi_I = \lambda^I_J(\psi_I) \circ \hat\pi^I_J$ *for any* $J \subset I \subset \mathcal{N}$ *and* $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$*.*

(v) *For any* $L, J, I \in \mathcal{N}$ *with* $L \subset J \subset I$ *it holds that* $\hat\pi^J_L \circ \hat\pi^I_J = \hat\pi^I_L$*.*

(vi) *For any* $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ *the isotropy group of* Γ_I *at* $\hat u_I \in \widehat{W}_I$ *is given by*

$$\Gamma_I(\hat u_I) = \Gamma_I(\tilde u_I) = \Gamma(\tilde u_{i_1}) \times \cdots \times \Gamma(\tilde u_{i_k}),$$

where $\tilde u_I = q_I(\hat u_I)$ *is given by (2.44) and* $\Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l})$ *is the isotropy group of* Γ_{i_l} *at* $\tilde u_{i_l}$ *as before. For* $l = 1, \cdots, |I|$, $|(\Gamma_I)_{\hat u_I}| = (|\Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l})|)^{|I|}$ *because these* $\Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l})$ *are isomorphic. Moreover, for* $u_I \in W_I$ *the inverse image* $(\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(u_I)$ *contains*

$$|\Gamma_I| - |\Gamma_I(\hat u_I)| + 1 = \prod_{l}^{|I|}(|\Gamma_{i_l}| - |\Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l})| + 1)$$

elements exactly.

(vii) *For any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ *and* $\hat u_J \in \mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)$ *the inverse image* $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\hat u_J)$ *exactly contains*

$$\frac{|\Gamma_I| - |\Gamma_I(\hat u_I)| + 1}{|\Gamma_J| - |\Gamma_J(\hat u_J)| + 1} = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J}(|\Gamma_i| - |\Gamma_J(\hat u_J)|^{1/|J|} + 1)$$

elements, where $\hat u_I \in (\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\hat u_J)$*. In particular, if* $\hat u_J \in \mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J) \cap \widehat{W}^\circ_J$ *then* $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\hat u_J)$ *contains* $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$ *elements exactly.*

(viii) *For any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ *it holds that* $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}\big(\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J) \cap \widehat{W}^\circ_J\big) = \widehat{W}^\circ_I$ *and* $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}\big(\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J) \cap \widehat{W}^{sing}_J\big) = \widehat{W}^{sing}_I$*. Moreover the restriction of* $\hat\pi^I_J$ *to* $\widehat{W}^\circ_I$ *is a* $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$*-fold (regular) covering to* $\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J) \cap \widehat{W}^\circ_J$*.*

(ix) *For any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ *and* $\hat u_I \in \widehat{W}_I$, $\lambda^I_J\big(\Gamma_I(\hat u_I)\big) = \Gamma_J(\hat u_J)$*, where* $\hat u_J = \hat\pi^I_J(\hat u_I)$*.*

(v) may easily follow from (2.38), and the final (vi)-(ix) are also easily proved by the above construction. But (vii) is not derived from (ix).

Remark 2.26 By (2.25) it is not hard to check that $\widehat{W}_I$ is intrinsic in the following sense. Assume that the space $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ in (2.34) is replaced by

$$\coprod_{\tilde u_I \in \widetilde{W}_I} \coprod_{O \in \mathcal{U}(u_I)} \coprod_{1 \le s \le |I|} \coprod_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s} \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}(\tilde u_{i_s}))$$

---

[2] This homeomorphism fact is not used in the arguments of this paper; we only need it to be a proper, continuous surjective map, which is obvious.

and that the equivalence relation in it is defined by

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I)$$

if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) $\tilde{y}_I = \tilde{y}'_I$ as points in $\widetilde{W}_I$;

(ii) $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s}) \bigcap \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^t_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_t})$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I$ near $\tilde{y}_I = \tilde{y}'_I$.

Here $\tilde{u}_I, \tilde{u}'_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$, $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$, and $\phi'_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}'_I)_t$, and $\tilde{y}_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\widetilde{O}_{i_s})$, $\tilde{y}'_I \in \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^t_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_t})$, and $\mathcal{U}(u_I)$ is the germ of small connected open neighborhood of u_I in W_I, and $\widetilde{O}_{i_s}(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) = \pi^{-1}_{i_s}(O)$, $s = 1, \cdots, |I|$. Then we get the same $\widehat{W}_I$, $\hat{\pi}_I$ and $\hat{\pi}^I_J$. In particular $\widehat{W}_I$ only depends on $\widetilde{W}_I$.

Similarly, we can define a desingularization $\widehat{E}_I$ of $\widetilde{E}_I$ and the bundle projection $\hat{p}_I : \widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{W}_I$ so that it is a Banach vector bundle. For later convenience we shall give necessary details. Corresponding with (2.34) let us consider the Banach manifold

$$\boxed{\widetilde{E}_I} := \coprod_{\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I} \coprod_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1} \coprod_{O \in \mathcal{U}(u_I)} \{(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I)\} \times \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}), \tag{2.46}$$

which is a Banach bundle over $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I}$ clearly. Here $\mathcal{U}(u_I)$ and $\widetilde{O}_{i_1} = \pi^{-1}_{i_1}(O)$ are as in (2.34), and Φ_I and Λ^s_I as in (2.28). Let us define a relation $\overset{e}{\sim}$ in $\boxed{\widetilde{E}_I}$ as follows: For $\tilde{u}_I, \tilde{u}'_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$, and $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1$, $\phi'_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}'_I)_1$, and $\tilde{\xi}_I \in \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}})$ and $\tilde{\xi}'_I \in \Phi'_I \circ \Lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_1}})$ we define

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I) \overset{e}{\sim} (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{\xi}'_I) \tag{2.47}$$

if and only the following two conditions hold:

(1°) $\tilde{\xi}_I = \tilde{\xi}'_I$ as points in $\widetilde{W}_I$;

(2°) $\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}) \bigcap \Phi'_I \circ \Lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_1}})$ is a local component of $\widetilde{E}_I$ near $\tilde{p}_I(\tilde{\xi}_I) = \tilde{p}_I(\tilde{\xi}'_I)$, where $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{W}_I$ is the obvious projection.

As in Claim 2.23 we can prove that $\overset{e}{\sim}$ is a regular equivalence. It is easy to see that the relation $\overset{e}{\sim}$ is compatible with $\sim$ in (2.35). That is,

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I) \overset{e}{\sim} (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{\xi}'_I) \Longrightarrow (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{p}_I(\tilde{\xi}_I)) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{p}_I(\tilde{\xi}'_I)) \quad \text{and}$$
$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I) \Longrightarrow (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{o}_I(\tilde{y}_I)) \overset{e}{\sim} (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{o}_I(\tilde{y}'_I)).$$

Here $\tilde{o}_I : \widetilde{W}_I \to \widetilde{E}_I$ is the zero section, which is well-defined though $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}_I \to \widetilde{W}_I$ is not a bundle projection.

Let $\langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I \rangle$ denote the equivalence class of $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I)$ with respect to $\overset{e}{\sim}$. Denote by

$$\widehat{E}_I = \boxed{\widetilde{E}_I}\Big/ \overset{e}{\sim} \tag{2.48}$$

if $|I|>1$, and by $\widehat{E}_I=\widetilde{E}_i$ if $I=\{i\}\in\mathcal{N}$. Then

$$\hat{p}_I:\widehat{E}_I\to\widehat{W}_I,\ \langle\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{\xi}_I\rangle\mapsto[\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{p}_I(\tilde{\xi}_I)] \tag{2.49}$$

is a Banach bundle, and each

$$\widehat{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^1_I}:\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}\to\widehat{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\langle\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^1_I(\tilde{\xi})\rangle, \tag{2.50}$$

gives a smooth bundle open embedding, called **a local bundle coordinate chart of $\widehat{E}_I$ near** $\langle\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{o}_I(\tilde{u}_I)\rangle$. The projections Π_I and Π^I_J induce natural ones

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\hat{\Pi}_I:\widehat{E}_I\to E_I,\ \langle\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{\xi}_I\rangle\mapsto\Pi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I),\\ \hat{\Pi}^I_J:\widehat{E}_I\to\widehat{E}_J,\ \langle\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{\xi}_I\rangle\mapsto\langle\tilde{u}_J,\phi_J,\tilde{\xi}_J\rangle\end{array}\right\} \tag{2.51}$$

which are well-defined because of Proposition 2.22(iii). Here $\phi_J=\lambda^I_J(\phi_I)=(\phi_l)_{l\in J}$, $\tilde{u}_J=\pi^I_J(\tilde{u}_I)=(\tilde{u}_l)_{l\in J}$ and $\tilde{\xi}_J=\Pi^I_J(\tilde{\xi}_I)=(\tilde{\xi}_l)_{l\in J}$. Moreover, in the bundle charts $\widehat{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^1_I}$ and

$$\widehat{\Phi_J\circ\Lambda^1_J}:\widetilde{E}_{j_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{j_1}}\to\widehat{E}_J,\ \tilde{\eta}\mapsto\langle\tilde{u}_J,\phi_J,\Phi_J\circ\Lambda^1_J(\tilde{\eta})\rangle,$$

the projection $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ may be represented by

$$\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}\to\widetilde{E}_{j_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{j_1}},\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\Lambda_{i_1j_1}(\tilde{\xi}) \tag{2.52}$$

because $j_1\in J\subset I$. Here $\Lambda_{i_1j_1}=1_{\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}}$ if $j_1=i_1$. It follows that $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ is a **smooth bundle map** and also **isomorphically maps** the fibre of $\widehat{E}_I$ at $[\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{p}_I(\tilde{\xi}_I)]\in\widehat{W}_I$ to that of $\widehat{E}_J$ at $[\tilde{u}_J,\phi_J,\tilde{p}_J(\tilde{\xi}_J)]\in\widehat{W}_J$.

In order to see how the action of Γ_I on $\widetilde{E}_I$ induces a natural one on $\boxed{\widetilde{E}_I}$, note that $\psi_I=(\psi_l)_{l\in I}\in\Gamma_I$ acts on $\widetilde{E}_I$ via

$$\psi_I\cdot\tilde{\xi}_I=\Psi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I)=(\Psi_l(\tilde{\xi}_l))_{l\in I}. \tag{2.53}$$

So for

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\xi}_I=\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^1_I(\tilde{\eta})\ &=\big(\tilde{\eta},\Phi_{i_2}\circ\Lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde{\eta}),\cdots,\Phi_{i_k}\circ\Lambda_{i_1i_k}(\tilde{\eta})\big)\\ &\in\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}})\subset\widetilde{E}_I\end{aligned}$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_I\cdot\tilde{\xi}_I&=\big(\Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta}),\Psi_{i_2}\circ\Phi_{i_2}\circ\Lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde{\eta}),\cdots,\Psi_{i_k}\circ\Phi_{i_k}\circ\Lambda_{i_1i_k}(\tilde{\eta})\big)\\ &=\big(\Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta}),\Phi^*_{i_2}\circ\Lambda^*_{i_1i_2}(\Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta})),\cdots,\Phi^*_{i_k}\circ\Lambda^*_{i_1i_k}(\Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta}))\big)\\ &=\Phi^*_I\circ\Lambda^{1*}_I(\Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta}))\in\Phi^*_I\circ\Lambda^{1*}_I\big(\Psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}})\big),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi^*_I=(\Phi^*_l)_{l\in I}=(\Psi_l\circ\Phi_l\circ\Psi_l^{-1})_{l\in I}$, and $\Lambda^{1*}_I=(\Lambda^*_{i_1l})_{l\in I}$, $\Lambda^*_{i_1l}=\Psi_l\circ\Lambda_{i_1l}\circ\Psi_{i_1}^{-1}$ for any $l\in I$. These motivate us to define

$$\psi_I\cdot(\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{\xi}_I)=\big(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I),\phi^*_I,\psi_I\cdot\tilde{\xi}_I\big). \tag{2.54}$$

Here $\phi_I^* = (\phi_l^*)_{l\in I} = (\psi_l \circ \phi_l \circ \psi_l^{-1})_{l\in I} \in \Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_1$ as in (2.40). It gives a smooth effective action of Γ_I on $\boxed{\widetilde{E}_I}$. As above ϕ_I^* belongs to $\Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_s$ as $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$. And for each $s \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$, if we define $\Lambda_I^{s*} = (\Lambda_{i_s l}^*)_{l\in I}$, $\Lambda_{i_s l}^* = \Psi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_s l} \circ \Psi_{i_s}^{-1}$ for any $l \in I$, then

$$\Phi_I^* \circ \Lambda_I^{s*} : \Psi_{i_s}(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}) \to \widetilde{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi}_s \mapsto \big(\Phi_l^* \circ \Lambda_{i_s l}^*(\tilde{\xi}_s)\big)_{l\in I} \tag{2.55}$$

is a smooth bundle open embedding, and $\{\Phi_I^* \circ \Lambda_I^{s*} \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a **local bundle coordinate chart** of $\widetilde{E}_I$ over the neighborhood $\psi_I\big(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)\big)$ of $\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$. In particular, we get a local bundle coordinate chart of $\widehat{E}_I$ around $\langle \psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi_I^*, \tilde{o}_I(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))\rangle$,

$$\widehat{\Phi_I^* \circ \Lambda_I^{*1}} : \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})} \to \widehat{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi} \mapsto \langle \psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi_I^*, \Phi_I^* \circ \Lambda_I^{*1}(\tilde{\xi})\rangle. \tag{2.56}$$

Let $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I) \overset{e}{\sim} (\tilde{u}_I', \phi_I', \tilde{\xi}_I')$ be as in (2.47). Then $\Psi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I) = \Psi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I')$ and

$$\Phi_I^* \circ \Lambda_I^{1*}\big(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})}\big) \bigcap \Phi_I'^* \circ \Lambda_I'^{1*}\big(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}'}\,)\big)$$

is a local component of $\widetilde{E}_I$ near $\tilde{p}_I(\Psi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I)) = \tilde{p}_I(\Psi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I'))$. So the action in (2.54) preserves the equivalence relation $\overset{e}{\sim}$ in $\boxed{\widetilde{E}_I}$, i.e.

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I) \overset{e}{\sim} (\tilde{u}_I', \phi_I', \tilde{\xi}_I') \Longleftrightarrow \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I) \overset{e}{\sim} \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I', \phi_I', \tilde{\xi}_I').$$

It follows that (2.54) induces a natural smooth effective action of Γ_I on $\widehat{E}_I$:

$$\psi_I \cdot \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle = \langle \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I)\rangle. \tag{2.57}$$

In fact, in the charts in (2.50) and (2.56) the action

$$\langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle = \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^1(\tilde{\eta})\rangle \mapsto \psi_I \cdot \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle$$

is given by the smooth map

$$(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})}) \quad \tilde{\eta} \mapsto \Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta}).$$

The effectiveness is also easily proved as before. Moreover, the clear continuous surjective map

$$Q_I : \widehat{E}_I \to \widetilde{E}_I,\ \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle \mapsto \tilde{\xi}_I$$

commutates with the above actions of Γ_I on $\widehat{E}_I$ and $\widetilde{E}_I$ and also satisfies $\Pi_I \circ Q_I = \hat{\Pi}_I$. As in the arguments above (2.45) we can derive that the projection $\hat{\Pi}_I$ is invariant under the Γ_I-action and induces a homeomorphism

$$\widehat{E}_I/\Gamma_I \to E_I,\ \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle \mapsto \Pi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I).$$

These arguments yield:

Proposition 2.27 **(i)** *Each* $\hat{p}_I : \widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{W}_I$ *is a Banach bundle.*

(ii) *There exists a smooth effective action of* Γ_I *on* $\widehat{E}_I$ *(given by (2.57)), and* $\hat{\Pi}_I$ *is invariant under the action and induces a homeomorphism from* $\widehat{E}_I/\Gamma_I$ *to* E_I*.*

(iii) *The projection* $\hat{p}_I : \widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{W}_I$ *is equivariant with respect to the actions of* Γ_I *on them, i.e.* $\hat{p}_I \circ \psi_I = \psi_I \circ \hat{p}_I$ *for any* $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$*.*

(iv) $\hat{\Pi}_J \circ \hat{\Pi}^I_J = \iota^E_{IJ} \circ \hat{\Pi}_I$ *for any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ *and the inclusion* $\iota^E_{IJ} : E_I \hookrightarrow E_J$*.*

(v) *For any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$*,* $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ *is a smooth bundle map covering* $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ *and also isomorphically maps the fibre of* $\widehat{E}_I$ *at* $\hat{u}_I \in (\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{W}_J)$ *to that of* $\widehat{E}_J$ *at* $\hat{\pi}^I_J(\hat{u}_I)$*. Moreover, it is* Γ_I*-equivariant, i.e.,* $\hat{\Pi}^I_J \circ \psi_I = \lambda^I_J(\psi_I) \circ \hat{\Pi}^I_J$ *for* $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$*.*

(vi) $\hat{\pi}_I \circ \hat{p}_I = p \circ \hat{\Pi}_I$ *for any* $\phi_I \in \Gamma_I$*.*

(vii) $\hat{p}_J \circ \hat{\Pi}^I_J = \hat{\pi}^I_J \circ \hat{p}_I$ *for any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$*.*

(viii) *For any* $L, J, I \in \mathcal{N}$ *with* $L \subset J \subset I$ *it holds that* $\hat{\Pi}^J_L \circ \hat{\Pi}^I_J = \hat{\Pi}^I_L$*.*

(vii) may easily follow from (2.51). We get a system of Banach bundles

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K)\big) = \big\{\big(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{W}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}, \quad (2.58)$$

which is called a **desingularization** of $\big(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widetilde{W}(K)\big)$ in (2.15).

Definition 2.28 A **global section** of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ is a compatible collection $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of sections $\widehat{S}_I$ of $\widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{W}_I$ in the sense that

$$\widehat{S}_I = (\hat{\Pi}^I_J)^* \widehat{S}_J := (\hat{\Pi}^I_J)^{-1} \circ \widehat{S}_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J, \quad (2.59)$$

i.e. $\widehat{S}_J(\hat{\pi}^I_J(x)) = \hat{\Pi}^I_J(\widehat{S}_I(x))$ for any $x \in \widehat{W}_I$ and $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. $\widehat{S}$ is said to be **smooth** if each $\widehat{S}_I$ is. $\widehat{S}$ is called **transversal** to the zero section if each section $\widehat{S}_I : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{E}_I$ is so. Furthermore, a global smooth section $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is called **Fredholm** if each $\widehat{S}_I$ is a Fredholm section. If each section $\widehat{S}_I$ is Γ_I-equivariant the global section $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I\}$ is said to be **equivariant**.

Lemma 2.29 *For each* $I \in \mathcal{N}$ *with* $|I| > 1$*, and* $l \in I$ *we denote by* $I_l = \{l\}$ *for* $1 \le l \le n$*. Then each smooth section* $\tilde{\sigma}_l : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l$ *can define one* $\hat{\sigma}_{lI} : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{E}_I$ *by*

$$\widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{E}_I,\ \hat{x} \mapsto \big((\hat{\Pi}^I_l)^* \tilde{\sigma}_l\big)(\hat{x}) = (\hat{\Pi}^I_l)^{-1}\big(\tilde{\sigma}_l(\hat{\pi}^I_{I_l}(\hat{x}))\big) \quad (2.60)$$

which is equal to $\tilde{\sigma}_l$ *if* $I = I_l$*. Moreover, if* $\tilde{\sigma}_l$ *is Fredholm then so is* $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$*.*

Proof. We first prove that the section $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$ is smooth. To this end let us write it in the charts in (2.37) and (2.50). Let $\hat{x} = \widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I}(\tilde{x}) = [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\tilde{x})]$ for $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{O}_{i_1}$. Then $\pi^I_{I_l}(\hat{x}) = [\tilde{u}_l, \phi_l, \phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x})] = \phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x})$, and specially equals $\tilde{x}$ if $l = i_1$. So $\tilde{\sigma}_l(\phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x})) = \langle \tilde{u}_l, \phi_l, \tilde{\sigma}_l(\phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}))\rangle$. As in (2.52), under the bundle charts $\widehat{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I}$ in (2.50) and

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\Phi_{I_l} \circ \Lambda^1_{I_l}} : \widetilde{E}_l|_{\widetilde{O}_l} \to \widehat{E}_{I_l},\\ &\qquad \tilde{\eta} \mapsto \langle \tilde{u}_{I_l}, \phi_{I_l}, \Phi_{I_l} \circ \Lambda^1_{I_l}(\tilde{\eta})\rangle = \langle \tilde{u}_l, \phi_l, \tilde{\eta}\rangle = \tilde{\eta},\end{aligned}$$

the projection $\hat{\Pi}^I_{I_l}$ may be represented by

$$\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}} \to \widetilde{E}_l|_{\widetilde{O}_l},\ \tilde{\xi} \mapsto \Phi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{\xi}).$$

It follows that $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$ may locally be represented as

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_1} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto (\Phi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_1 l})^{-1}\big(\tilde{\sigma}_l(\phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}))\big). \tag{2.61}$$

This shows that $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$ is smooth. The other claims follows from this clearly. □

A class of special sections of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ may be derived from those of the Banach orbibundle $E \to X$.

Lemma 2.30 *Each (smooth) section S of the Banach orbibundle $E \to X$ may yield a global (smooth) section of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$, denoted by $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. The section $\widehat{S}$ is equivariant in the sense that each $\widehat{S}_I$ is Γ_I-equivariant. If S is Fredholm so is $\widehat{S}$ and they has the same index.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i$ unique Γ_i-equivariant lifts of $S|_{W_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. They are compatible in the sense that

$$\tilde{S}_j \circ \lambda_{ij} = \Lambda_{ij} \circ \tilde{S}_i \quad \text{on} \quad \widetilde{O}_i,\ i, j = 1, \cdots, n,$$

where λ_{ij}, Λ_{ij} and $\widetilde{O}_i$ are as above. Since $\Pi_i \circ \tilde{S}_i = S \circ \pi_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ we have a map

$$\tilde{S}_I : \widetilde{W_I} \to \widetilde{E}_I,\ \tilde{x}_I = (\tilde{x}_i)_{i \in I} \mapsto (\tilde{S}_i(\tilde{x}_i))_{i \in I}.$$

This map determines a (smooth) section of the Banach bundle $\hat{p}_I : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{E}_I$. In fact, let $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$, and $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\tilde{x})) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}'))$ in $\boxed{\widehat{W_I}}$ for $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{O}_{i_1}$ and $\tilde{x}' \in \widetilde{O}'_{i_1}$. Using the local chart $\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I$ in the proof of Proposition 2.22 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{S}_I\big(\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\tilde{x})\big) &= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}), \tilde{S}_{i_2}\big(\phi_{i_2} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x})\big), \cdots, \tilde{S}_{i_k}\big(\phi_{i_k} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}), \phi_{i_2} \cdot \tilde{S}_{i_2}\big(\lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x})\big), \cdots, \phi_{i_k} \cdot \tilde{S}_{i_k}\big(\lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}), \Phi_{i_2}\big(\tilde{S}_{i_2}\big(\lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x})\big)\big), \cdots, \Phi_{i_k}\big(\tilde{S}_{i_k}\big(\lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big)\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}), \Phi_{i_2}\big(\Lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}))\big), \cdots, \Phi_{i_k}\big(\Lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}))\big)\Big)\\
&= \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x})),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{S}_I\big(\phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}')\big) &= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}'), \tilde{S}_{i_2}\big(\phi'_{i_2} \circ \lambda'_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}')\big), \cdots, \tilde{S}_{i_k}\big(\phi'_{i_k} \circ \lambda'_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x}')\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}'), \phi_{i_2} \cdot \tilde{S}_{i_2}\big(\lambda'_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}')\big), \cdots, \phi'_{i_k} \cdot \tilde{S}_{i_k}\big(\lambda'_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x}')\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}'), \Phi'_{i_2}\big(\tilde{S}_{i_2}\big(\lambda'_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}')\big)\big), \cdots, \Phi'_{i_k}\big(\tilde{S}_{i_k}\big(\lambda'_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x}')\big)\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}'), \Phi'_{i_2}\big(\Lambda'_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}'))\big), \cdots, \Phi'_{i_k}\big(\Lambda'_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}'))\big)\Big)\\
&= \Phi'_I \circ \Lambda'^1_I(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}')).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x}) = \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}')(\Longrightarrow \tilde{x} = \tilde{x}')$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{S}_I\big(\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x})\big) &= \Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^1(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}))\\ &= \Phi'_I \circ \Lambda'^1_I(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}')) = \tilde{S}_I\big(\phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}')\big).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\widetilde{O}_{i_1}) \cap \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{O}'_{i_1})$ is a local component of $\widehat{W}_I$ near $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x}) = \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}')$. It follows that

$$\Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^1(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}}) \cap \Phi'_I \circ \Lambda'^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_1}})$$

is a local component of $\widehat{E}_I$ near $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x}) = \phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}')$. This shows that

$$\Big(\tilde{u}_I, \tilde{\phi}_I, \tilde{S}_I\big(\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x})\big)\Big) \overset{e}{\sim} \Big(\tilde{u}'_I, \tilde{\phi}'_I, \tilde{S}_I\big(\phi'_I \circ \lambda'^1_I(\tilde{x}')\big)\Big) \quad \text{or}$$

$$\widehat{\Phi'_I \circ \Lambda'^1_I}(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}')) = \widehat{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^1}(\tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x})).$$

So we may define $\widehat{S}_I : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{E}_I$ by

$$[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{x}_I] \mapsto \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{s}_I(\tilde{x}_I)\rangle. \tag{2.62}$$

It is easy to see that in the charts of (2.37) and (2.50) the section may be expressed as

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_1} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_1}},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{S}_{i_1}(\tilde{x}). \tag{2.63}$$

Thus $\widehat{S}_I$ is a **smooth section**, and its zero set is given by

$$Z(\widehat{S}_I) = (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}\big(Z(S) \cap W_I\big).$$

From (2.38) and (2.51) one can immediately derive

$$\widehat{S}_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J = \hat{\Pi}^I_J \circ \widehat{S}_I \tag{2.64}$$

for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. Finally, one easily checks that each $\widehat{S}_I$ is Γ_I-equivariant. From (2.63) it easily follows that each $\widehat{S}_I$ and thus $\widehat{S}$ are Fredholm if S is so. □

As done in Section 1 our aim is to give a small perturbation of the Fredholm section $\widehat{S}$ so that it becomes transversal to the zero section. The arguments at the beginning of this section show that such a purpose can only be realized by perturbations of the nonequivariant global sections. However, even if $\tilde{\sigma}_l : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l$ has compact support contained in $\widetilde{W}_l$ one mayt not be able to extend the collection $\{\hat{\sigma}_{lI} : I \in \mathcal{N},\ l \in I\}$ of sections given by Lemma 2.29 into a global smooth section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ because the sets W_i overlap too much to satisfy the compatibility conditions of the definition. (cf. Ex.4.7 in [Mc1].) So we need to make some improvements on it.

2.3.2 Renormalization of the resolution in (2.58)

In this subsection we shall improve the resolution in last subsection. Note that each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ has length $|I| < n$. For the above open sets W_i, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, one may take pairs of open sets

$$W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j,\ j = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1,$$

such that

$$U_i^1 \subset\subset W_i^2 \subset\subset U_i^2 \cdots \subset\subset W_i^{n-1} \subset\subset U_i^{n-1} \subset\subset W_i.$$

Then for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$ define

$$V_I := \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W_i^k\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U_j^k))\Big). \tag{2.65}$$

Then the second condition in (2.8) implies

$$V_I = W_I^{n-1} := \cap_{i\in I} W_i^{n-1} \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{N} \text{ with } |I| = n-1.$$

For $\{V_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$, unlike $\{W_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ we cannot guarantee that $V_I \subset V_J$ even if $J \subset I$. However, Lemma 4.3 in [LiuT1] showed:

Lemma 2.31 *$\{V_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is an open covering of $\cup_{i=1}^n W_i^1$ and satisfies:*

(i) *$V_I \subset W_I$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$.*

(ii) *$Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ only if $I \subset J$ or $J \subset I$. (Actually $Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ implies $V_I \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$, and thus $Cl(V_I) \cap V_J = \emptyset$ for any $I, J \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = |J| = n-1$.)*

(iii) *For any nonempty open subset $\mathcal{W}^* \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W_i^1$ and $I \in \mathcal{N}$ let $W_I^* = W_I \cap \mathcal{W}^*$ and $V_I^* = V_I \cap \mathcal{W}^*$. Then $\{V_I^* \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is an open covering of $\mathcal{W}^*$, and also satisfies the above corresponding properties (i)-(ii).*

Proof. *Step 1.* Let $\mathcal{N}_k = \{I \in \mathcal{N} \,|\, |I| = k\}$, $k = 1, \cdots, n-1$. We first prove that $\{V_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is an open covering of $\cup_{i=1}^n W_i^1$. It is easy to see that for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$,

$$V_I = \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W_i^k\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{N}_{k+1}} (\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U_j^k))\Big).$$

For $x \in W_i$, set $I_1 = \{i\}$. If $x \in V_{I_1}$ nothing is done. Otherwise, there is $J_1 \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|J_1| = 2$ such that $x \in \cap_{j\in J_1} Cl(U_j^1) \subset W_{J_1}^2$. Set $I_2 = I_1 \cup J_1$ then $x \in W_{I_1}^1 \cap W_{J_1}^2 \subset W_{I_1}^2 \cap W_{J_1}^2$ and thus

$$x \in W_{I_2}^2 \subset W_{I_2}^{|I_2|},\ |I_2| \geq |J_1| = |I_1| + 1 = 2.$$

If $x \in V_{I_2}$ then nothing is done. Otherwise, because of (2.65) there is $J_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|J_2| = |I_2| + 1$ such that $x \in \cap_{j\in J_2} Cl(U_j^{|I_2|}) \subset W_{J_2}^{|J_2|}$. Set $I_3 = I_2 \cup J_2$ then $x \in W_{I_2}^2 \cap W_{J_2}^{|J_2|} \subset W_{I_2}^{|I_3|} \cap W_{J_2}^{|I_3|}$ and thus

$$x \in W_{I_3}^{|I_3|},\ |I_3| \geq |J_2| = |I_2| + 1 \geq 3.$$

After repeating finite times this process there must exist some $I_k \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $x \in V_{I_k}$ because $V_I = W_I^{n-1}$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = n-1$. The desired conclusion is proved.

Step 2. We prove (i) and (ii). (i) is obvious. We only need to prove (ii). Let $Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ for two different $I, J \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$ and $|J| = l$.

Since $I=\{1,\cdots,n\}\notin\mathcal{N}$ we can assume that $n>k\ge l$ below. Suppose that there exists a $r\in J\setminus I$. Let $x\in Cl(V_I)\cap V_J$. Take a sequence $\{x_k\}\subset V_I$ such that $x_k\to x$. Since V_J is open then $x_k\in V_J$ for k sufficiently large. So $V_I\cap V_J\ne\emptyset$ and we may assume that $x\in V_I\cap V_J$. Now one hand $x\in V_J$ implies that

$$x\in Cl\big(\cap_{i\in J}W_i^l\big)\subset Cl\big(\cap_{i\in J}W_i^k\big)\subset Cl(W_r^k).$$

On the other hand $x\in V_I$ implies that x does not belong to

$$\begin{aligned}\cap_{i\in I}Cl(U_i^k)\cap Cl(U_r^k)\ &\supseteq\cap_{i\in I}Cl(W_i^k)\cap Cl(W_r^k)\\ &\supseteq Cl(\cap_{i\in I}W_i^k)\cap Cl(W_r^k).\end{aligned}$$

So $x\notin Cl(W_r^k)$ because $x\in V_I\subset Cl\big(\cap_{i\in I}W_i^k\big)$. This contradiction shows that $J\subset I$.

Step 3. Note that $Cl(V_I^*)\cap V_J^*\subset Cl(V_I)\cap V_J\cap\mathcal{W}^*$ for any $I,J\in\mathcal{N}$. The desired conclusions follow immediately. □

Remark 2.32 From the proof of Lemma 2.31 one easily sees: if there exists a positive integer $1<n_0<n$ such that $W_I=\emptyset$ for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$ with $|I|\ge n_0$ then one only needs to take $n(n_0-1)$ pairs of open sets, $W_i^j\subset\subset U_i^j$, $j=1,2,\cdots,n_0-1$ such that

$$U_i^1\subset\subset W_i^2\subset\subset U_i^2\cdots\subset\subset W_i^{n_0-1}\subset\subset U_i^{n_0-1}\subset\subset W_i.$$

In this case for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ with $|I|=k<n_0$ we still use (2.65) to define V_I. Then $V_I=W_I^{n_0-1}$ for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$ with $|I|=n_0-1$, and $\{V_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ still satisfies Lemma 2.31. Our later arguments are also effective actually for this general case.

Set

$$\widehat{V}_I=(\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(V_I)\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{F}_I=(\widehat{\Pi}_I)^{-1}(E_I|_{V_I}),\tag{2.66}$$

For $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$, though $\hat\pi_J^I(\widehat{W}_I)\subset\widehat{W}_J$ we cannot guarantee that $\hat\pi_J^I(\widehat{V}_I)\subset\widehat{V}_J$. So $\hat\pi_J^I$ only defines a smooth map from the open subset $(\hat\pi_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J)\cap\widehat{V}_I=(\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(V_I\cap V_J)$ to $\widehat{V}_J$. However, **we still denote by** $\hat\pi_J^I$ the restriction of $\hat\pi_J^I$ to $(\hat\pi_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J)\cap\widehat{V}_I$. In this case it holds that

$$\hat\pi_J\circ\hat\pi_J^I=\iota_{IJ}^V\circ\hat\pi_I$$

for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$, where $\iota_{IJ}^V:V_I\cap V_J\hookrightarrow V_J$ is the inclusion. Similarly, $\widehat{\Pi}_J^I$ denote the restriction of $\widehat{\Pi}_J^I$ to $(\widehat{\Pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{F}_J)\cap\widehat{F}_I$. We still use $\hat p_I$ to denote the bundle projection $\widehat{F}_I\to\widehat{V}_I$ induced by one $\hat p_I:\widehat{E}_I\to\widehat{W}_I$ in (2.49). The system of Banach bundles

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K),\widehat{V}(K))=\big\{(\widehat{F}_I,\widehat{V}_I),\hat\pi_I,\hat\pi_J^I,\widehat{\Pi}_I,\widehat{\Pi}_J^I,\hat p_I,\Gamma_I\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\tag{2.67}$$

is called **renormalization** of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K),\widehat{W}(K))$.

We can define a **global section** of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$ as in Definition 2.28, but the compatibility condition (2.59) is replaced by

$$S_I = (\hat{\Pi}^I_J)^* S_J := (\hat{\Pi}^I_J)^{-1} \circ S_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J, \quad \text{on } (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J). \tag{2.68}$$

Clearly, each section of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ restricts to one of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$, still denoted by $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. The other notions are defined with the same way.

Lemma 2.33 *For $1 \le l \le n$, if a smooth section $\tilde{\sigma}_l : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l$ has a support contained in $\widetilde{W}^1_l := \pi_l^{-1}(W^1_l)$ then it may determine a smooth global section $\hat{\sigma}_l = \{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$ and for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $l \in I$ the section $(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I$ is exactly the restriction of the section given by (2.60) to $\widehat{V}_I$.*

Proof. For $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$ and $l \notin I$, (2.65) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_I &= \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^k_i\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|=k+1} (\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U^k_j))\Big) \\
&\subset \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^k_i\Big) \setminus \Big((\bigcap_{i\in I} Cl(U^k_i)) \cap Cl(U^k_l)\Big) \\
&\subset \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^k_i\Big) \setminus \Big((\bigcap_{i\in I} Cl(U^k_i)) \cap Cl(W^1_l)\Big) \\
&= \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^k_i\Big) \setminus Cl(W^1_l) \\
&\subset \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} Cl(W^k_i)\Big) \setminus W^1_l
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inclusion is because $W^1_l \subset U^1_l \subset U^k_l$, and the second equality comes from the fact that $\cap_{i\in I} W^k_i \subset \cap_{i\in I} U^k_i$. It follows that

$$Cl(V_I) \subset \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} Cl(W^k_i)\Big) \setminus W^1_l$$

since the left side is closed. But $\pi_l(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\sigma}_l)) \subset W^1_l$. Hence

$$\pi_l(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\sigma}_l)) \cap Cl(V_I) = \emptyset \quad \forall\, l \notin I,\, 1 \le l \le n. \tag{2.69}$$

We define

$$(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I = \begin{cases} \quad 0 & \text{if } l \notin I, \\ \tilde{\sigma}_{lI}|_{\widehat{V}_I} & \text{if } l \in I. \end{cases} \tag{2.70}$$

Here σ_{lI} is given by (2.60). It is easily checked that the collection $\{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is compatible in the sense of (2.68). Hence $\hat{\sigma}_l = \{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is a smooth global section of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$. □

For an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of K in $\cup_{i=1}^n W^1_i$ we set $V^*_I := V_I \cap \mathcal{W}^*$ and

$$\widehat{V}^*_I = (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(V^*_I), \qquad \widehat{F}^*_I = (\hat{\Pi}_I)^{-1}(F_I|_{V^*_I}). \tag{2.71}$$

As above we get a system of Banach bundles

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*) = \big\{(\widehat{F}^*_I, \widehat{V}^*_I), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \widehat{\Pi}_I, \widehat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I \,\big|\, J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}, \tag{2.72}$$

which is called the **restriction** of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$ to the open subset $\mathcal{W}^*$. Similarly, we can define its global section. Clearly, each global section $\hat{\sigma} = \{(\hat{\sigma})_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$ restricts to a global section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*)$, still denoted by $\hat{\sigma}$ without confusions.

Remark 2.34 For each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ let us take pairs of open subsets $W^{+j}_i \subset\subset U^{+j}_i$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$ such that

$$W^j_i \subset\subset W^{+j}_i \subset\subset U^{+j}_i \subset\subset U^j_i,\ j = 1, \cdots, n-1.$$

Then for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$ we follow (2.65) to define

$$V^+_I := \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^{+k}_i\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U^{+k}_j))\Big)$$

and get another renormalization $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+(K), \widehat{V}^+(K))$ of the system of Banach bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$. It is easily seen that for any section $\tilde{\sigma}_l : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l$ with support in $\widetilde{W}^1_i$, the same reason as above may yield a global smooth section $\hat{\sigma}^+_l = \{(\hat{\sigma}_l)^+_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+(K), \widehat{V}^+(K))$ which restricts to $\hat{\sigma}_l$ on $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$. Note that for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Cl(V_I) \quad &\subset \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} Cl(W^k_i)\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\bigcap_{j\in J} U^k_j)\Big) \\ &\subset \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^{+k}_i\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U^{+k}_j))\Big) = V^+_I \end{aligned}$$

because $Cl(W^k_i) \subset W^{+k}_i$ and $Cl(U^{+k}_i) \subset U^k_i$ for any i, k. Let $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)$ (resp. $Cl(\widehat{F}^*_I)$) be the closure $\widehat{V}^*_I$ (resp. $\widehat{F}^*_I$) in $\widehat{V}^+_I$ (resp. $\widehat{F}^+_I$). Then we may also consider the system of Banach bundles

$$(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*), Cl(\widehat{V}^*)) = \big\{(Cl(\widehat{F}^*_I), Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \widehat{\Pi}_I, \widehat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I \,\big|\, J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$$

and define its global section by requiring that $S_J(\hat{\pi}^I_J(x)) = \hat{\Pi}^I_J(S_I(x))$ for $x \in (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(Cl(\widehat{V}^*_J)) \cap Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)$ and $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. In this case, the above section $\hat{\sigma}^+_l$ naturally restricts to a section $(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*), Cl(\widehat{V}^*))$, still denoted by $\hat{\sigma}_l$ without confusions. Moreover, the section $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$ in Lemma 2.33 naturally restricts to a global (smooth) section of $(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*), Cl(\widehat{V}^*))$.

2.4 Transversality

As in Section 2.3 we also assume that X is 1-regular and effective. Remark 2.49 is still effective. From now on we always make:

Assumption 2.35 (X, E, S) is a Banach Fredholm orbibundle of index r and compact zero locus $Z(S)$.

Taking $K = Z(S)$ then (2.58) and (2.67) give a system of Banach bundles

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W}\big) = \Big\{\big(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{W_I}\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \widehat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \widehat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I, \lambda^I_J \;\Big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\Big\},$$

and its renormalization system of Banach bundles

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}) = \big\{(\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \widehat{\Pi}_I, \widehat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I\, \lambda^I_J \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}. \tag{2.73}$$

Since the Fredholm map is locally proper, by shrinking open sets W_i we can make:

Assumption 2.36 Each Banach bundle $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W_i}$ is trivializable and the unique Γ_i-equivariant lift section $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i$ of $S|_{W_i}$ has a proper Fredholm trivialization representative.

Let $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ be the Fredholm section of the bundle systems $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W}\big)$ produced by Lemma 2.29 from the section S. It restricts to such a section of the bundle systems $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{V})$, also denoted by $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ without confusions.

2.4.1 Local transversality

For each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ let $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i$ be the Γ_i-equivariant lifts of $S|_{W_i}$. Fix a trivialization

$$\mathcal{T}_i : \widetilde{W_i} \times (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i, \tag{2.74}$$

we get a representation of $\widetilde{S}_i$,

$$\widetilde{S}^T_i : \widetilde{W_i} \to (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i},\ \textit{i.e.},\ \widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x}) = \mathcal{T}_i(\tilde{x}, \widetilde{S}^T_i(\tilde{x}))\ \forall \tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W_i}. \tag{2.75}$$

It is a proper Fredholm map by Assumption 2.36. Since the differential $d\widetilde{S}^T_i(\tilde{x}_i) : T_{\tilde{x}_i}\widetilde{W_i} \to (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$ is a linear Fredholm operator there exist finitely many nonzero elements $v_{ij} \in (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$, such that

$$d\widetilde{S}^T_i(\tilde{x}_i)(T_{\tilde{x}_i}\widetilde{W_i}) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_{i1}, \cdots, v_{im_i}\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}. \tag{2.76}$$

Using v_{ij} and the trivialization $\mathcal{T}_i$ we get smooth sections $\tilde{s}_{ij} : \widetilde{W_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i$ by

$$\tilde{s}_{ij}(\tilde{x}) = \mathcal{T}_i(\tilde{x}, v_{ij})\ \forall \tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W_i},\ j = 1, \cdots, m_i.$$

Note that $\tilde{s}_{ij}(\tilde{x}) \neq 0$ for any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W_i}$ since under the trivialization $\mathcal{T}_i$ the section $\tilde{s}_{ij}$ has exactly a representation,

$$\widetilde{W_i} \to (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto v_{ij}.$$

So using the implicit function theorem (by furthermore shrinking W_i and increasing n) we can make:

Assumption 2.37 *$d\widetilde{S}^T_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i)+\mathrm{span}(\{v_{i1},\cdots,v_{im_i}\})=(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$ for any $\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{W}_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n$.*

For each $i=1,\cdots,n$ let us take a Γ_i-invariant smooth cut-off function $\gamma_i:\widetilde{W}^1_i\to[0,1]$ with support $\mathrm{supp}(\gamma)\subset\subset\widetilde{W}^1_i$ and denote by

$$\widetilde{U}^0_i:=\{\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{W}^1_i\,|\,\gamma_i(\tilde{x})>0\}\quad\text{and}\quad U^0_i=\pi_i(\widetilde{U}^0_i). \tag{2.77}$$

Then $U^0_i\subset\subset W^1_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. We may also assume that

$$Z(S)\subset\bigcup_{i=1}^n U^0_i. \tag{2.78}$$

This can be done since $Z(S)\subset\cup_{i=1}^n W^1_i$. Setting

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}:=\gamma_i\cdot\tilde{s}_{ij},\ j=1,\cdots,m_i, \tag{2.79}$$

they are smooth sections of the Banach bundle $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$ with support in $\widetilde{W}^1_i$, and have representations under the trivialization $\mathcal{T}_i$,

$$\tilde{\sigma}^T_{ij}:\widetilde{W}_i\to(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i},\ \tilde{x}\mapsto\gamma(\tilde{x})v_{ij},\ j=1,\cdots,m_i. \tag{2.80}$$

It easily follows from Assumption 2.37 that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} d\widetilde{S}^T_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i)+\mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}^T_{i1}(\tilde{x}),\cdots,\tilde{\sigma}^T_{im_i}(\tilde{x})\})=(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}\\ \forall\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{U}^0_i,\ i=1,\cdots,n.\end{array}\right\} \tag{2.81}$$

By Lemma 2.33 each $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ yields a smooth section $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}=\{(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$ in (2.73), $j=1,\cdots,m_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n$.

2.4.2 Global transversality

Let $m=m_1+\cdots+m_n$. Consider the obvious pullback Banach bundle system

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}},\widehat{V}\times\mathbb{R}^m\big) \\ &=\big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I,\widehat{V}_I\times\mathbb{R}^m),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\widehat{\Pi}_I,\widehat{\Pi}^I_J,\hat{p}_I,\Gamma_I\ \big|\ J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\end{aligned} \tag{2.82}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_1$ are the projections to the first factor, and $\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\widehat{\Pi}_I,\widehat{\Pi}^I_J,\hat{p}_I$ are naturally pullbacks of those projections in (2.73). It has a Fredholm section $\Upsilon=\{\Upsilon_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon_I:\widehat{V}_I\times\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I,\\ &\Big(\hat{x}_I,\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le n}}\Big)\mapsto\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\\ &\qquad\qquad=\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I).\end{aligned} \tag{2.83}$$

The final equality comes from (2.69). Clearly, $\Upsilon_I(\hat{x}_I,0)=0$ for any zero $\hat{x}_I$ of $\hat{S}_I$ in $\widehat{V}_I$.

Theorem 2.38 *There exists an open neighborhood* $\mathcal{W}^*$ *of* $Z(S)$ *in* $\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$ *and* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that for the restriction bundle system* $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*)$ *of* $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$ *to* W^* *the restriction of the global section* $\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ *to* $(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ *is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section. Consequently, for each* $I \in \mathcal{N}$ *the set*

$$\widehat{\Omega}_I(S) := \{(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in \widehat{V}_I^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \,|\, \Upsilon_I(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) = 0\} \tag{2.84}$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S) + m$ *and with compact closure in* $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \times \mathbb{R}^m \subset \widehat{V}_I^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m$. *Moreover, the family* $\{\widehat{\Omega}_I(S) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ *is compatible in the sense that for any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_I(S)\big) = \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_J(S) \quad \text{and}$$

that for any $(\hat{x}_J, \mathbf{t}) \in \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_J(S)$ *all*

$$\frac{|\Gamma_I| - |\Gamma_I(\hat{x}_I)| + 1}{|\Gamma_J| - |\Gamma_J(\hat{x}_J)| + 1} = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J} (|\Gamma_i| - |\Gamma_J(\hat{x}_J)|^{1/|J|} + 1)$$

elements of the inverse image $(\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}((\hat{x}_J, \mathbf{t}))$ *sit in* $(\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ *for any* $(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in (\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}((\hat{x}_J, \mathbf{t}))$. *So for*

$$\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)^\circ := \widehat{\Omega}_J(S) \cap (\widehat{W}_J^\circ \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)), \tag{2.85}$$

the restriction of the projection

$$\hat{\pi}_J^I : (\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_I(S) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_J(S) \tag{2.86}$$

to $(\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_I(S)^\circ$ *is a* $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$*-fold (regular) smooth covering to* $\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_J(S)^\circ$.

Proof. Let $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+, \widehat{V}^+)$ be another renormalization of the system of Banach bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$ as in Remark 2.34. Then $Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widehat{V}_I^+$ for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, $\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ can naturally extend to a Fredholm section $(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+, \widehat{V}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m)$, still denoted $\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. Let $\hat{u}_I \in Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)$. Then $\Upsilon_I(\hat{u}_I, 0) = 0$. Note that $u_I = \hat{\pi}_I(\hat{u}_I) \in \cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$ and thus sits in $U_{i_q}^0 \subset W_{i_q}^1$ for some $i_q \in I$ because of (2.69). By Remark 2.26 and as in (2.37) we have the local chart of the Banach manifold $\widehat{W}_I$ near $\hat{u}_I$,

$$\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^q} : \widetilde{O}_{i_q} \to \widehat{W}_I,\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^q(\tilde{x})], \tag{2.87}$$

such that $\hat{u}_I = \widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^q}(\tilde{u}_{i_q})$ for $\tilde{u}_{i_q} \in \widetilde{O}_{i_q}$. We also have the corresponding Banach bundle chart as in (2.50),

$$\widehat{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^q} : \widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}} \to \widehat{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi} \mapsto \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \Phi_I \circ \Lambda_I^q(\tilde{\xi}) \rangle. \tag{2.88}$$

In these charts, as in (2.63) the section $\hat{S}_I$ has the local expression

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_q} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto \widetilde{S}_{i_q}(\tilde{x}),$$

and as in (2.61) the section $(\hat\sigma_{ij})_I$ can be represented as

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_q} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}},\ \tilde x \mapsto (\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde\sigma_l(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde x))\big)$$

if $i \in I$. Using these we can get the following local expression of Υ_I in the natural pullback charts of those in (2.87) and (2.88),

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon_{Iq} : \widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbf{P}_1^*(\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}), \\ &\Big(\tilde x, \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\Big) \mapsto \tilde S_{i_q}(\tilde x) + \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde\sigma_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde x))\big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.89}$$

(Actually we here should replace $\widetilde{O}_{i_q}$ by its open subset $(\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^q})^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widetilde{O}_{i_q}$. To save notations we still use $\widetilde{O}_{i_q}$.) Let $\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^q}(\tilde u_{i_q}) = \hat u_I$. Then $\tilde u_{i_q} \in \widetilde{U}^0_{i_q}$ because $u_I \in U^0_{i_q}$. We need to prove that the section Υ_{Iq} in (2.89) is transversal to the zero section at $(\tilde u_{i_q}, 0)$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde S_{i_q}(\tilde x) + \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde\sigma_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde x))\big) \\ &= \tilde S_{i_q}(\tilde x) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} t_{i_q j}\tilde\sigma_{i_q j}(\tilde x) \\ &+ \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde\sigma_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde x))\big).\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote by

$$\tilde\tau^q_{ij}(\tilde x) = (\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde\sigma_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde x))\big). \tag{2.90}$$

Then in view of the trivialization representations in (2.75) and (2.80) the section

$$\Upsilon_{Iq} = \tilde S_{i_q} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} t_{i_q j}\tilde\sigma_{i_q j} + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}\tilde\tau^q_{ij}$$

has the trivialization representation:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon^T_{Iq} : \widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde x_{i_q}}, \\ &(\tilde x, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S^T_{i_q}(\tilde x) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} t_{i_q j}\sigma^T_{i_q j}(\tilde x) + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}\tau^{qT}_{ij}(\tilde x),\end{aligned} \tag{2.91}$$

where τ^{qT}_{ij}, as in (2.75), is defined by

$$\widetilde{\tau}^q_{ij}(\tilde x) = \mathcal{T}_i(\tilde x, \widetilde{\tau}^{qT}_{ij}(\tilde x))\ \forall \tilde x \in \widetilde{W}_i.$$

Note that the tangent map of Υ^T_{Iq} at $(\tilde u_{i_q}, 0)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&d\Upsilon^T_{Iq}(\tilde u_{i_q}, 0) : T_{\tilde u_{i_q}}\widetilde{W}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde x_{i_q}}, \\ &(\tilde\xi, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto dS^T_{i_q}(\tilde u_{i_q})(\tilde\xi) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} v_{i_q j}\sigma^T_{i_q j}(\tilde u_{i_q}) + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} v_{ij}\tau^{qT}_{ij}(\tilde u_{i_q}).\end{aligned} \tag{2.92}$$

It immediately follows from (2.81) that the map in (2.92) is a surjective continuous linear Fredholm operator. This shows that the section Υ_{Iq} in (2.89) is transversal to the zero section at $(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, 0)$. Consequently, Υ_I is transversal to the zero section at $(\hat{u}_I, 0)$. Note that $Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)$ is a **compact** subset in $\widehat{V}_I^+$. Using the implicit function theorem we may get an open neighborhood $U\big(Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)\big) \subset\subset \widehat{V}_I^+$ of $Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)$ in $\widehat{V}_I^+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

(A) For any $(\hat{u}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in U\big(Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)\big) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and the local trivialization representative Υ^T_{Iq} as above the tangent map

$$d\Upsilon^T_{Iq}(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, \mathbf{t}) : T_{\tilde{u}_{i_q}} \widetilde{W}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde{x}_{i_q}}$$

is a surjective continuous linear Fredholm operator. In particular, the restriction of Υ_I to the open subset $U\big(Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)\big) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is Fredholm and also transversal to the zero section.

(B) The restriction of Υ_I to the closure of $U\big(Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)\big) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ (in $\widehat{V}_I^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m$) has compact zero set.

Let us take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $Z(S)$ in $\cup_{i=1}^n W_i$ so that

$$\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^* \cap V_I) \subset U\big(Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)\big) \; \forall I \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Then for the bundle $\widehat{F}_I^* \to \widehat{V}_I^*$ obtained from this $\mathcal{W}^*$ and as in (2.71) it holds that:

(C) For any $(\hat{u}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in \widehat{V}_I^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and the local trivialization representative Υ^T_{Iq} as above the tangent map

$$d\Upsilon^T_{Iq}(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, \mathbf{t}) : T_{\tilde{u}_{i_q}} \widetilde{W}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde{x}_{i_q}}$$

is a **surjective** continuous linear Fredholm operator. In particular, the section $\Upsilon_I : \widehat{V}_I^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{F}_I^*$ is Fredholm and also transversal to the zero section.

(D) the zero set of Υ_I has **compact closure** in $\widehat{V}_I^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finite, by shrinking $\varepsilon > 0$ it follows that the restriction of the section $\Upsilon = \big\{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ to $(\mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ is Fredholm and also transversal to the zero section. In particular, from the implicit function theorem we derive that each $\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S) + m$ and with compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \times \mathbb{R}^m \subset \widehat{V}_I^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

Since Υ restricts to a global section of $\big(\mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\big)$ it is clear that $\hat{\pi}^I_J\big((\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_I(S)\big) = \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_J(S)$ for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. Next note that the section $\hat{S}_I$ (resp. $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I$) is defined by the pullback of $\hat{S}_J$ (resp. $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_J$) under the projection $\hat{\pi}^I_J$. It follows that for any $(\hat{x}_J, \mathbf{t}) \in \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_J(S)$ the inverse image $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}((\hat{x}_J, \mathbf{t}))$ must be contained in $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap \widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$. The other conclusions are easily derived. □

From now on assume that X is **separable** so that the Sard-Smale theorem may be used. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is a finite set Theorem 2.38 and the Sard-Smale theorem immediately give:

Corollary 2.39 *There exists a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the global section $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})} \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the Banach bundle system $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big)$ is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section. Here $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})} &: \widehat{V}_I^* \to \widehat{F}_I^*, \\ &\hat{x}_I \mapsto \Upsilon_I(\tilde{x}, \mathbf{t}) = \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I).\end{aligned} \tag{2.93}$$

So the set $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) := (\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})})^{-1}(0)$ is a manifold of dimension $r = \mathrm{Ind}(S)$ and has a compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \subset \widehat{V}_I^+$. Moreover, the family

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \,:\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\} \tag{2.94}$$

is compatible in the sense that for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)\big) = \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \quad \text{and}$$

that for any $\hat{x}_J \in \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ the inverse image $(\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\hat{x}_J)$ contains

$$\frac{|\Gamma_I| - |\Gamma_I(\hat{x}_I)| + 1}{|\Gamma_J| - |\Gamma_J(\hat{x}_J)| + 1} = \prod_{i\in I\setminus J}(|\Gamma_i| - |\Gamma_J(\hat{x}_J)|^{1/|J|} + 1)$$

elements and all sit in $(\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ for any $\hat{x}_I \in (\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\hat{x}_J)$. So for

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ := \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cap \widehat{W}_J^\circ = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cap \widehat{V}_J^{*\circ} \quad \text{and} \\ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^{sing} := \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cap \widehat{W}_J^{sing} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cap \widehat{V}_J^{*sing}\end{array}\right\} \tag{2.95}$$

it also holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ\big) &= \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ, \\ \hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^{sing}\big) &= \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^{sing}\end{aligned}$$

and the restriction of the projection

$$\hat{\pi}_J^I : (\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \tag{2.96}$$

to $(\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ$ is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold (regular) smooth covering to $\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ$. Also note that each $\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)(\mathrm{resp.}\, \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ) \to X$ is proper.

Furthermore, we also have:

Proposition 2.40 **(i)** *For any given small open neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $Z(S)$ *in* $\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$ *there exists* $\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon)$ *such that* $\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)) \subset \mathcal{U}$ *and* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$.

(ii) *For any two* $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ *there exist generic path* $\gamma : [0,1] \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *with* $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}$ *and* $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{t}'$ *such that for each* $I \in \mathcal{N}$ *the set*

$$(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0) := \cup_{t \in [0,1]} \{t\} \times (\Upsilon_I^{\gamma(t)})^{-1}(0)$$

is a smooth manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S) + 1$ *and with boundary* [3] $\{0\} \times \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cup (-\{1\} \times \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}'}(S))$*; Moreover, the family* $(\Psi^\gamma)^{-1}(0) = \{(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ *is compatible in the similar sense to (2.96).*

(iii) *Assume* $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon]$ *so that the closure of* $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}} \hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S))$ *in* $\cup_{i=1}^n W_i$ *may be contained in* $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}} V_I^*$ *for any* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)$*. (This is always possible by (i) and Theorem 2.38.) Then for any* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *the set* $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}} \hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S))$ *is compact. Consequently, the family* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ *is "like" an open cover of a compact manifold. Specially, each* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ *is a finite set provided that* $\mathrm{Ind}(S) = 0$.

(iv) *For any* $z \in Z(S)$ *there exists a residual subset* $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}^z \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ *such that for each* $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}^z$ *the union* $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ *cannot contain* z*. Furthermore, there exist a small neighborhood* O_z *of* z *in* X *and a subset* $H_z \subset \mathbb{R}^m$*, which is the union of finitely many subspaces in* $\mathbb{R}^m$ *of codimension at least one, such that for a small open neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$ *of* $S^m \cap H_z$ *in the unit sphere* S^m *of* $\mathbb{R}^m$ *and the open cone* $\angle\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$ *spanned by* $\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$ *it holds that*

$$\left(\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)\right) \cap (O_x \cap Z(S)) = \emptyset$$

for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \setminus \angle\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$.

Proof. (i) Assume that the conclusion does not hold. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finite there exists a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in $\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$, some $I \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbf{t}_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\hat{u}_{Ik} \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}_k}(S)$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, such that $\mathbf{t}_k \to 0$ and $u_{Ik} = \hat{\pi}_I(\hat{u}_{Ik}) \notin \mathcal{U}$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. Note that $(u_{Ik}, \mathbf{t}_k) \in \widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ for each k. By Theorem 2.38, $\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ has a compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \times \mathbb{R}^m \subset \widehat{V}_I^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m$. We may assume that $\hat{u}_{Ik} \to \hat{u}_I \in Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \subset \widehat{V}_I^+$. It follows that $\Upsilon_I(\hat{u}_I, 0) = 0$ and thus $u_I = \hat{\pi}_I(\hat{u}_I) \in Z(S) \subset \mathcal{U}$. This contradicts to the fact that $u_{Ik} \notin \mathcal{U}$ for each k.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')$ denote the space of all C^l-smooth paths $\gamma : [0,1] \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ connecting $\mathbf{t}$ to $\mathbf{t}'$. It is a Banach manifold. Consider the pullback Banach bundle system

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0,1]\right)\\ &= \left\{\left(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^* \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0,1]\right), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I \;\middle|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

---

[3] We here have assumed that (X, E, S) is oriented and the moduli spaces have been oriented according to Proposition 2.44. Otherwise the following negative sign should be removed.

and its global section $\Psi = \{\Psi_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_I : \widehat{V}_I^* \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0,1] &\to \mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{F}_I^*, \\ (\hat{x}_I, \gamma, s) &\mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \gamma(s)_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I).\end{aligned} \tag{2.97}$$

Here $\gamma(s) = \{\gamma(s)_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$, $\mathbf{P}_1$ is the projection to the first factor, and $\hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \hat{p}_I$ are naturally pullbacks of those projections in (2.72). We want to prove that Ψ_I is transversal to the zero section. Let $(\hat{u}_I, \gamma_0, \tau) \in \widehat{V}_I^* \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0,1]$ be the zero of Ψ_I. As in proof of Theorem 2.38 we have $u_I = \hat{\pi}_I(\hat{u}_I) \in \cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$ and thus may assume that $u_I \in U_{i_q}^0 \subset W_{i_q}$ for some $i_q \in I$. Similar to (2.89), using the pullback charts of those in (2.87) and (2.88) we can get the local expression of Ψ_I,

$$\begin{aligned}&\widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0,1] \to \mathbf{P}_1^*(\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}), \\ &(\tilde{x}, \gamma, s) \mapsto \tilde{S}_{i_q}(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} \gamma(s)_{ij} \tilde{\sigma}_{i_q j} + \sum_{i \in I\setminus\{i_q\}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \gamma(s)_{ij} \tilde{\tau}_{ij}^q,\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_{ij}^q$ is defined by (2.90). As in (2.91) it has the following trivialization representation:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{Iq}^T : \widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0,1] &\to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde{x}_{i_q}}, \\ (\tilde{x}, \gamma, s) &\mapsto S_{i_q}^T(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} \gamma(s)_{i_q j} \sigma_{i_q j}^T(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{i \in I\setminus\{i_q\}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \gamma(s)_{ij} \tau_{ij}^{qT}(\tilde{x}).\end{aligned} \tag{2.98}$$

Here τ_{ij}^{qT} is as in (2.91). Then for Υ_{Iq}^T in (2.91) it holds that $\Psi_{Iq}^T(\tilde{x}, \gamma, s) = \Upsilon_{Iq}^T(\tilde{x}, \gamma(s))$. So for $\tau \ne 0, 1$ and any $(\tilde{\xi}, \alpha) \in T_{(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, \gamma_0)}\big(\widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')\big)$ it holds that

$$d\Psi_{Iq}^T(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, \gamma_0, \tau)(\tilde{\xi}, \alpha, 0) = d\Upsilon_{Iq}^T(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, \gamma(\tau))(\tilde{\xi}, \alpha(\tau)).$$

This and (C) in the proof of Theorem 2.38 together imply that the tangent map $d\Psi_{Iq}^T(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, \gamma_0, \tau)$ is a surjective continuous linear Fredholm operator.

If $\tau = 0$ or 1 then $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}$ and $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{t}'$. Note that the sections $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}$ and $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}$ are transversal to the zero section. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}&(\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1})^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widetilde{O}_{i_q} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}, \\ &\tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{S}_{i_q}(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{i \in I\setminus\{i_q\}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} \tilde{\tau}_{ij}(\tilde{x}) \quad \text{and} \\ &\tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{S}_{i_q}(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{i \in I\setminus\{i_q\}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t'_{ij} \tilde{\tau}_{ij}(\tilde{x})\end{aligned}$$

are transversal to the zero section, or their trivialization representations

$$\begin{aligned}&(\widehat{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^q})^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I)\cap\widetilde{O}^{\alpha}_{i_q}\to(\widetilde{E}_{i_q\alpha})_{\tilde{x}_{i_q\alpha}},\\&\tilde{x}\mapsto S^T_{i_q}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}}t_{i_qj}\sigma^T_{i_qj}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}\tau^{qT}_{ij}(\tilde{x})\quad\text{and}\\&\tilde{x}\mapsto S^T_{i_q}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}}t'_{i_qj}\sigma^T_{i_qj}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t'_{ij}\tau^{qT}_{ij}(\tilde{x})\end{aligned}$$

have the surjective tangent map at $\tilde{u}_{i_q}$ respectively. These imply that if $\tau=0$ (resp. $\tau=1$) the map Ψ^T_{Iq} in (2.98) has the surjective tangent map at $(\tilde{u}_{i_q},\gamma_0,0)$ (resp. $(\tilde{u}_{i_q},\gamma_0,1)$).

In summary, we have proved that the tangent map $d\Psi^T_{Iq}(\tilde{u}_{i_q},\gamma_0,\tau)$ is a surjective continuous linear Fredholm operator. So the section Ψ_I is transversal to the zero section at $(\hat{u}_I,\gamma_0,\tau)$. Then the standard arguments show that the section

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi^{\gamma}_I:\widehat{V}^*_I\times[0,1]\to\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I,\\&(\hat{x}_I,s)\mapsto\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\gamma(s)_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\end{aligned}\tag{2.99}$$

is transversal to the zero section for a generic $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')$. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finite we get that the global section $\Psi^{\gamma}=\{\Psi^{\gamma}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of the pullback Banach bundle system

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*\times[0,1]\big)\\&=\big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}^*_I,\widehat{V}^*_I\times[0,1]),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\hat{\Pi}_I,\hat{\Pi}^I_J,\hat{p}_I,\Gamma_I\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

is transversal to the zero section for a generic $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')$. Fix a generic $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')$ then the (smooth) manifold with boundary (and corner)

$$(\Psi^{\gamma}_I)^{-1}(0)=\big\{(\hat{x}_I,s)\in\widehat{V}^*_I\times[0,1]\,|\,\Psi_I(\hat{x}_I,\gamma,s)=0\big\}\tag{2.100}$$

forms a cobordism between $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)$ for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$. Note that $\Upsilon^{\gamma(t)}_I(x)=\Psi^{\gamma}_I(x,t)$ for $(x,t)\in\widehat{V}^*_I\times[0,1]$. (ii) is proved.

(iii) By the choice of δ, for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)$, the closure of $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ in $\cup_{i=1}^nW_i$ is contained in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V^*_I$. We want to prove that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ is compact. By Corollary 2.39 each $\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ has the compact closure in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\widehat{V}^+_I\subset\cup_{i=1}^nW_i$, and the compact subset

$$Cl\big(\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\big)=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\big)\subset\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V^*_I.$$

It follows that any $x\in Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\big)\setminus\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\subset Cl(V^*_I)$ may be contained in V^*_L for some $L\in\mathcal{N}$. So $Cl(V_I)\cap Cl(V_L)\ne\emptyset$. By Lemma 2.31 it holds that $I\subset L$ or $L\subset I$. Let $I\subset L$ and $x=\hat{\pi}_L(\hat{x}_L)$ for some $\hat{x}_L\in\widehat{V}^*_L$. By Remark 2.34 we may assume $x=\hat{\pi}_I(\hat{x}_I)$ for some $\hat{x}_I\in$

$Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)$. Since $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}\,|\, I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ may be extended into a global section of the bundle system $\big(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*), Cl(\widehat{V}^*)\big)$ naturally. We get that $\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_I)=0$. Since $\hat{\pi}_I^L(\hat{x}_L)=\hat{x}_I$ we get that $\Upsilon_L^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_L)=0$ and thus $x\in\hat{\pi}_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S))$ because of $x\in V_L^*$. This shows that $Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\big)\subset\cup_{J\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_J(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$. For the case $L\subset I$ we have $\hat{\pi}_L^I(\hat{x}_I)=\hat{x}_L$. It follows from $\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_I)=0$ that $\Upsilon_L^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_L)=0$. Hence it also holds that $x=\hat{\pi}_L(\hat{x}_L)\in\hat{\pi}_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S))$. In summary we get that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\big)\subset\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ and hence $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\big)$ is compact.

The final claim is actually a direct consequence of the above arguments. For the sake of clearness we prove it as follows. If $\mathrm{Ind}(S)=0$ then each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is a manifold of dimension zero. Assume that it contains infinitely many points $\hat{x}^{(k)}$, $k=1,2,\cdots$. We may assume that $\{\hat{\pi}_I(\hat{x}^{(k)})\}$ converges to some $x\in\hat{\pi}_L\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S)\big)$ because $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ is compact. Note that the inverse image of each point by $\hat{\pi}_I$ contains at most $|\Gamma_I|$ points and that $\{\hat{\pi}_I(\hat{x}^{(k)})\}$ are contained in the closed subset $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)\subset\widehat{V}_I^+$. After passing to a subsequence we may assume that $\{\hat{x}^{(k)}\}$ converges to some $\hat{x}_I\in Cl\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\big)$. Thus $\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_I)=0$. However, the section $\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}$ is still transversal to the zero section at $\hat{x}_I$ because $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. This destroys the manifold structure of $(\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})})^{-1}(0)$ near $\hat{x}_I$. The desired conclusion is proved.

(iv) By (2.78) we may assume $z\in U_1^0$ without loss of generality. It follows from the constructions of $\tilde{s}_{1j}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{1j}$ in (2.79) that $\tilde{\sigma}_{1j}(\tilde{z})\ne 0$ for any $\tilde{z}\in\pi_1^{-1}(z)$. By Lemma 2.33 one easily sees that for $I\in\mathcal{N}$ with $1\notin I$, $(\hat{\sigma}_{1j})_I(\hat{z})\ne 0$ for any $\hat{z}_I\in\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(z)$. For each such I and $\hat{z}_I$ the kernel of the nonzero linear map

$$\mathbb{R}^m\to\hat{F}_{I\hat{z}},\ \mathbf{t}\to\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{z}_I)$$

has at lease codimension one. Denote the kernel by $H_{\hat{z}_I}$. Let $\mathcal{N}_1=\{I\in\mathcal{N}\,|\,1\notin I\}$ and $H_z=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}_1}\cup_{\hat{z}_I\in\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(z)}H_{\hat{z}_I}$. Then $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^z_{res}:=(\mathbb{R}^m\setminus H_z)\cap B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ is also a residual subset in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and for each $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^z_{res}$, $I\in\mathcal{N}_1$ and $\hat{z}_I\in\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(z)$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{z}_I)\ne 0.$$

This implies the conclusion.

Next the proof of the second claim is similar to Remark 1.8. For a given small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap H_z)$ of $S^m\cap H_z$ in the unit sphere S^m in $\mathbb{R}^m$ it is easily proved that there exists a small neighborhood O_z of z in X such that for each $I\in\mathcal{N}_1$, $\hat{x}_I\in\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(O_z)$ and $\mathbf{t}\in S^m\setminus\mathcal{U}(S^m\cap H_z)$ one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\ne 0.$$

So for the open cone $\angle\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$ spanned by $\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$ and any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \setminus \angle\mathcal{U}(S^m \cap H_z)$ it holds that

$$\big(\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)\big) \cap (O_z \cap Z(S)) = \emptyset.$$

□

Remark 2.41 Now $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ$ in (2.95) is not necessarily dense in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$. It might even be empty. The set $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^{sing}$ in (2.95) is not necessarily a subvariety in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$ of lower dimension.

Because of the shortcoming stated in the above remark one cannot use the family $\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ to construct the desired Euler class. We need to suitably refine the above arguments so as to improve our present results.

Firstly, we require that the Banach orbifold charts $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ at the beginning of Section 2.3.1 are all centred at some $x_i \in X$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. This means that $\pi_i^{-1}(x_i) = \{\tilde{x}_i\}$ and $\Gamma_i = \Gamma_i(\tilde{x}_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. If $\Gamma_i \neq \{\mathbb{1}\}$, i.e., $x_i \in X^{sing}$, by the proof of Claim 2.5 we may shrink W_i to require that

$$\pi_i^{-1}(X^{sing} \cap W_i) = \bigcup_{g\in\Gamma_i\setminus\{\mathbb{1}\}} F_i\big(N(0_{\tilde{x}_i}) \cap \nu(dg(\tilde{x}_i))\big), \tag{2.101}$$

where $\nu(dg(\tilde{x}_i)) = \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbb{1} - dg(\tilde{x}_i))$ and F_i is a Γ_i-equivariant diffeomorphism from a neighborhood $N(0_{\tilde{x}_i})$ of the origin in $T_{\tilde{x}_i}\widetilde{W}_i$ onto $\widetilde{W}_i$. Note that Γ_i is finite. There exist two cases:

- Each subspace in $\{\nu(dg(\tilde{x}_i) - \mathbb{1}) | g \in \Gamma_i \setminus \{\mathbb{1}\}\}$ is the zero space $\{0\}$ and thus x_i must be an isolated singular point.
- There exist at least a nonzero space in $\{\nu(dg(\tilde{x}_i) - \mathbb{1}) | g \in \Gamma_i \setminus \{\mathbb{1}\}\}$. In this case we may assume that $H_{i1}, \cdots, H_{il_i}$ are all nontrivial subspaces consisting of the subspaces in $\{\nu(dg(\tilde{x}_i) - \mathbb{1}) | g \in \Gamma_i\}$ and their intersections. If some H_{is} has codimension more than $r+1 = \mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$, by Proposition C.2 we can choose a closed subspace of codimension $r+1$ containing it to replace H_{is}. Let us also denote this subspace by H_{is}. Then we can assume that

$$\mathrm{codim}(H_{i1}) \le \mathrm{codim}(H_{i2}) \le \cdots \le \mathrm{codim}(H_{il_i}) \le r + 1. \tag{2.102}$$

Clearly, $\cap_{s=1}^{l_i} H_{is} = \{0\}$. Set $\widetilde{P}_{is} = F_i\big(N(0_{\tilde{x}_i}) \cap H_{is}\big)$, $s = 1, \cdots, l_i$. Then each $\widetilde{P}_{is}$ is a (relatively closed connected) Banach submanifold of $\widetilde{W}_i$ which contains $\tilde{x}_i$ as a (relative) interior point, and has also the same codimension as H_{is}, $s = 1, \cdots, l_i$. Moreover it also holds that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \pi_i^{-1}(X^{sing} \cap W_i) \subset \cup_{s=1}^{l_i}\widetilde{P}_{is} \quad \text{and} \quad \cap_{s=1}^{l_i}\, \widetilde{P}_{is} = \{\tilde{x}_i\} \\ T_{\tilde{x}_i}\widetilde{P}_{is} = H_{is},\ s = 1, \cdots, l_i. \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.103}$$

It follows from Proposition C.1 that the restriction of the section $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ in (2.75) to each $\widetilde{P}_{is}$ is also Fredholm and has index $r - \mathrm{codim}\widetilde{P}_{is}$. Moreover under the trivialization naturally induced by $\mathcal{T}_i$ in (2.74) these restrictions have trivialization representatives

$$\widetilde{S}_i^T|_{\widetilde{P}_{is}} : \widetilde{P}_{is} \to (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i},\ s = 1, \cdots, n_i.$$

These are Fredholm. By increasing m_i in (2.76) and shrinking W_i we may also require that

$$d\widetilde{S}_i^T|_{\widetilde{P}_{is}}(\tilde{x}_i)(T_{\tilde{x}_i}\widetilde{P}_{is}) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_{i1}, \cdots, v_{im_i}\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$$

and furthermore that for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $s = 1, \cdots, n_i$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} d\widetilde{S}_i^T|_{\widetilde{P}_{is}}(\tilde{y})(T_{\tilde{y}}\widetilde{P}_{is}) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_{i1}, \cdots, v_{im_i}\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}, \\ d\widetilde{S}_i^T(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{P}_{is}) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_{i1}, \cdots, v_{im_i}\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i} \\ \qquad \forall \tilde{y} \in \widetilde{W}_i \cap \widetilde{P}_{is} \text{ and } \forall \tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i. \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.104}$$

In this case the sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ (and $\tilde{s}_{ij}$) obtained as in (2.79) are called **optimal** (for (X, E, S)). From these it follows that if $\tilde{u}_{i_q}$ in (2.92) belongs to some $\widetilde{P}_{i_q s}$ then the tangent map of the restriction of Υ_{Iq}^T at $(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, 0)$,

$$d\Upsilon_{Iq}^T(\tilde{u}_{i_q}, 0) : T_{\tilde{u}_{i_q}}\widetilde{H}_{i_q s} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde{x}_{i_q}},$$

$$(\tilde{\xi}, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto d(S_{i_q}^T|_{\widetilde{H}_{i_q s}})(\tilde{u}_{i_q})(\tilde{\xi}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} v_{i_q j}\sigma_{i_q j}^T(\tilde{u}_{i_q}) + \sum_{i \in I\setminus\{i_q\}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} v_{ij}\tau_{ij}^{qT}(\tilde{u}_{i_q})$$

is also surjective. So by shrinking W^* and $\varepsilon > 0$ in Theorem 2.38 we get that for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$, $i \in I$ and $s = 1, \cdots, l_i$ the restriction of the section Υ_I to each Banach submanifold

$$\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \subset \widehat{V}_I^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$$

is also transversal to the zero section, where $P_{is} = \pi_i(\widetilde{P}_{is})$. In this case we say the section Υ_I to be **strongly transversal** to the zero section. It follows that for generic $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ the restriction of the section $\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}$ in Corollary 2.39 to each Banach submanifold $\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \subset \widehat{V}_I^*$ is also transversal to the zero section. Thus the submanifold

$$\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(P_{is}) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I(S)$$

has codimension $\mathrm{codim}P_{is}$. Set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^v = \cup_{i\in I} \cup_{s=1}^{l_i} \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S). \tag{2.105}$$

It is a subvariety in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ and also contains $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^{sing}$.

Furthermore, carefully checking the proof of Proposition 2.40(ii) one easily sees that for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$, $i \in I$ and $s = 1, \cdots, l_i$, the restriction of the section Ψ_I in (2.97) to $\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \times [0, 1]$ is not only Fredholm but also transversal to the zero section. Since $Z(S)$ is compact and $\mathcal{N}$ is finite it follows that for a generic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')$ the restriction of the section Ψ_I^γ in (2.99) to each $\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \times [0, 1]$ is Fredholm and transversal to the zero section. Denote this restriction by Ψ_{Iis}^γ. Then the smooth manifold $(\Psi_{Iis}^\gamma)^{-1}(0)$ has codimension $\mathrm{codim}P_{is}$ in $(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0)$ and also boundary

$$\big(\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)\big) \bigcup \big(-\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I^* \cap P_{is}) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)\big).$$

[4] Here $(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)$ is as in (2.100). Denote by

$$(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)^v = \bigl(\cup_{i\in I}\cup_{s=1}^{l_i}\hat\pi_I^{-1}(\widehat V_I^*\cap P_{is})\times[0,1]\bigr)\cap(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0). \qquad (2.106)$$

It is a subvariety in $(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)$ and contains all singular points of $(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)$. Moreover, if we understand the boundary of $(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)^v$ to be the union of all branch submanifolds, i.e.,

$$\partial(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)^v = \bigcup_{i\in I}\bigcup_{s=1}^{l_i}\partial\bigl((\hat\pi_I^{-1}(\widehat V_I^*\cap P_{is})\times[0,1])\cap(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)\bigr). \qquad (2.107)$$

Then it holds that

$$\partial(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)^v = \widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v\cup(-\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t'}_I(S)^v). \qquad (2.108)$$

Summarizing the above arguments we get:

Proposition 2.42 *There exists a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb R^m)_{res}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb R^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf t\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb R^m)_{res}$ the family $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}(S)$ in Corollary 2.39 can be chosen to have also properties: For each $I\in\mathcal N$ there exists a subvariety $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v\subset\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)$ such that*

- **(i)** $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^{sing}\subset\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v$,
- **(ii)** *each branch of $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v$ has dimension lower than r and thus $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^\circ = \widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)\setminus\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^{sing}\supseteq\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)\setminus\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v$ is an open and dense submanifold in $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)$,*
- **(iii)** *if each $x\in X^{sing}\cap Z(S)$ has singular codimension $r'\ge 1$ then $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v$ has no branch submanifolds of codimension $r'\ge 1$,*
- **(iv)** *the family $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}(S)^v=\{\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v\,|\,I\in\mathcal N\}$ is compatible in the sense that that for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal N$,*

  $$\hat\pi^I_J\bigl((\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat V_J^*)\cap\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v\bigr) = \mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_J(S)^v,$$

- **(v)** $\cup_{I\in\mathcal N}\hat\pi_I\bigl(\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v\bigr)$ *is a compact subset in* $\cup_{I\in\mathcal N}\hat\pi_I\bigl(\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)\bigr)$,
- **(vi)** *for any two $\mathbf t,\mathbf t'\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb R^m)_{res}$ there exist generic paths $\gamma:[0,1]\to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb R^m)$ with $\gamma(0)=\mathbf t$ and $\gamma(1)=\mathbf t'$ such that for each $I\in\mathcal N$ there exists a subvariety $\partial(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)^v$ of the manifold $\partial(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)$ in Proposition 2.40(ii) such that:*
  - *containing all singular points of $\partial(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)$,*
  - *(2.108) holding, i.e., $\partial(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)^v=\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)^v\cup(-\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t'}_I(S)^v)$,*
  - *satisfying the obvious properties corresponding with (ii)-(v) above.*

Later we call $(\Psi^\gamma)^{-1}(0)=\{(\Psi^\gamma_I)^{-1}(0)|I\in\mathcal N\}$ as in (vi) a **strong cobordsim** between $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}(S)=\{\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t}_I(S)|I\in\mathcal N\}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t'}(S)=\{\widehat{\mathcal M}^{\mathbf t'}_I(S)|I\in\mathcal N\}$.

---

[4] The negative signs here and in the following (2.108) are to be understood as in the footnote to Proposition 2.40(ii).

Remark 2.43 (i) If X has no boundary (or more generally $Z(S) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$) then (smooth) manifold $(\Psi_I^{\gamma})^{-1}(0)$ in (2.100) has only boundary but no corner for $\varepsilon >$ sufficiently small. In this case the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ is "like" an open cover of a closed manifold. If $Z(S) \cap \partial X \neq \emptyset$ then the manifold $(\Psi_I^{\gamma})^{-1}(0)$ in (2.100) might has only boundary but corner.
(ii) If S has been transversal to the zero section so is the section $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. In this case $S^{-1}(0)$ is a compact orbifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ and $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. It follows from Proposition 2.42 that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{0}}_I(S)) = S^{-1}(0)$ and that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{0}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{0}}_I(S) : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is cobordant to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. Actually, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ is exactly a resolution of the orbifold $S^{-1}(0)$.
(iii) Sometimes it is useful and convenient to write the compatible family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ in the tight version. Following [Mc1] consider the disjoint union $\coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation that is generated by setting $\hat y_I \sim \hat z_J$ if $J \subset I$ and $\hat\pi^I_J(\hat y_I) = \hat z_J$. Denote by

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) := \coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)/\sim$$

and by $\hat q_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ the restriction of the obvious quotient map to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$. Let us write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) := \hat q_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$. In general, $\hat q_I$ is not a homeomorphism from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ onto $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$. We also write

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ := \coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ/\sim \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ = \hat q_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ)$$

for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$. Set

$$\lambda_I : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \to \mathbb{Q},\ \bar x \mapsto \frac{|\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|}{|\Gamma_I| - |(\Gamma_I)_{\hat x_I}| + 1},$$

where $|\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|$ is the number of elements in the set $\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)$ and $\hat x_I$ is any element in $\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)$. If $J \subset I$ and $\bar x \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \cap \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$ it is easily checked that $\lambda_I(\bar x) = \lambda_J(\bar x)$. So all these λ_I give a positive rational function on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$, denoted by λ, is called the **label function**. In particular, $\lambda(\bar x) = |\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|/|\Gamma_I|$ for any $\bar x \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$. All $\hat\pi_I$ can be glued into a natural map

$$\hat\pi : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \to X.$$

Its restriction on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ is also denoted by $\hat\pi$ when there is no danger of confusion.

Later we directly write $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ as $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S))$ when there is no danger of confusion. Moreover, we always assume that the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ also satisfies Proposition 2.42.

2.5 Orientation

We assume that X is as in Section 2.4. Now we begin to consider the orientation of the family of manifolds $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$. By

Proposition 2.42 each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$ is an open dense subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$. Moreover for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$, by (2.96) the projection $\hat\pi^I_J$ restricts to a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold regular smooth covering

$$(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ.$$

Thus we may say it to be **orientation preserving** provided that both $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$ are oriented. Later, the statement that $\hat\pi^I_J$ is orientation preserving should always be understood in the way. We call the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ **oriented** if each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is oriented and each projection $\hat\pi^I_J$, $J \subset I$, is orientation preserving.

Proposition 2.44 *If the Banach Fredholm orbibundle* (X, E, S) *is oriented then the family* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ *has an induced orientation.*

Proof. We only need to prove that $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ **is oriented as a Fredholm section of the system of Banach bundles** $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$. This means that each determinant line bundle $\det(D\widehat{S}_I) \to \widehat{W}_I$ is given an orientation, i.e. a continuous nowhere zero section, and that for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $J \subset I$ the bundle map

$$\det(D\widehat{S}_I)|_{(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{W}^\circ_I)} \to \det(D\widehat{S}_J)|_{\widehat{W}^\circ_J}$$

induced by the projection $(\hat\pi^I_J, \hat\Pi^I_J)$, which maps a fiber at $\hat x_I \in (\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{W}^\circ_I)$ to that of $\hat\pi^I_J(\hat x_I) \in \widehat{W}^\circ_J$ isomorphically, is orientation preserving.

By the definition below Definition 2.11 let $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ be the Γ_i-equivariant lift of $S|_{W_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then for any $u \in W_i \cap W_j$, $\tilde u_i = \pi_i^{-1}(u)$ and $\tilde u_j = \pi_j^{-1}(u)$ there exist a connected open neighborhood O of u in $W_i \cap W_j$, a group isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{ij} : \Gamma(\tilde u_i) \to \Gamma(\tilde u_j)$, a $\mathcal{A}_{ij}$-equivariant diffeomorphism $\lambda_{ij} : \widetilde{O}_i = \pi_i^{-1}(O) \to \widetilde{O}_j = \pi_j^{-1}(O)$ and a bundle isomorphism $\Lambda_{ij} : \widetilde{E}_i|_{\widetilde{O}_i} \to \widetilde{E}_j|_{\widetilde{O}_j}$ covering λ_{ij} such that

$$\widetilde{S}_j \circ \lambda_{ij} = \Lambda_{ij} \circ \widetilde{S}_i \quad \text{on} \quad \widetilde{O}_i. \tag{2.109}$$

That S is oriented means that each $\tilde S_i$ is oriented, i.e. the determinant bundle $\det(D\tilde S_i)$ over $Z(\tilde S_i)$ is given a continuous nowhere zero section $o(\widetilde{S}_i)$, and that for every pair $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$ there exist positive continuous functions $f_{ij} : \widetilde{O}_i \to \mathbb{R}$, such that for any $\tilde x \in \widetilde{O}_i$,

$$\det(\Lambda_{ij})\big(o(\widetilde{S}_i)(\tilde x)\big) = f_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}(\tilde x)) \cdot o(\widetilde{S}_j)\big(\lambda_{ij}(\tilde x)\big).$$

We first show that they induce such a section of $\det(D\widehat{S}_I)$ for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| > 1$. Here $\widehat{S}_I : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{E}_I$ is defined by (2.62). Let $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $k > 1$. For any $\tilde u_I \in \widetilde{W}_I$ and $u_I = \pi_I(\tilde u_I)$ let $\widetilde{O}_{i_l} = \pi_{i_l}^{-1}(O)$, $\lambda_{i_q i_l}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{i_q i_l} : \Gamma(\tilde u_{i_q}) \to \Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l})$ be as in the proof of Lemma 2.19. Let $o(\tilde S_i)$ be the continuous nowhere zero section of $\det(D\tilde S_i)$ defining the orientation of $\tilde S_i$. For any two $i_q, i_l \in I$, by the bundle isomorphism $\Lambda_{i_q i_l}$ above (2.17) and the first paragraph there exist positive continuous functions $f_{i_l i_q}:\widetilde{O}_{i_l}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\det(\Lambda_{i_q i_l})\big(o(\tilde{S}_{i_q})(\tilde{x})\big)=f_{i_l i_q}(\lambda_{i_q i_l}(\tilde{x}))\cdot o(\tilde{S}_{i_l})\big(\lambda_{i_q i_l}(\tilde{x})\big)$$

for any $\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{O}_{i_q}$. For the section in (2.63),

$$\widehat{S}_I:\widehat{W}_I\to\widehat{E}_I,[\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{x}_I]\mapsto\langle\tilde{u}_I,\phi_I,\tilde{S}_I(\tilde{x}_I)\rangle,$$

it may be expressed as

$$\widetilde{O}_{i_q}\to\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}},\ \tilde{x}\mapsto\widetilde{S}_{i_q}(\tilde{x})\tag{2.110}$$

in the charts $\widehat{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^q}$ in (2.87) and $\widehat{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda_I^q}$ in (2.88), $q=1,\cdots,k$. So the orientation of $\widetilde{S}_{i_q}$ naturally gives one of $\widehat{S}_I|_{\widehat{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^q}(\widetilde{O}_{i_q})}$. What we need to prove is that these orientations agree on overlaps.

Let $\widehat{W}_I^\circ$ be as in (2.45). Then it suffices to check that those orientations agree on overlaps near any $\hat{u}_I\in\widehat{W}_I^\circ$. In this case we may require that $\widetilde{O}_{i_q}\subset\widetilde{W}_{i_q}^\circ$, and thus the corresponding charts in (2.87) and (2.88) may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\lambda_I^q}:\widetilde{O}_{i_q}\to\widehat{W}_I^\circ,\ \tilde{x}\mapsto[\tilde{u}_I,1_I,\lambda_I^q(\tilde{x})],\\&\widehat{\Lambda_I^q}:\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}\to\widehat{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\langle\tilde{u}_I,1_I,\Lambda_I^q(\tilde{\xi})\rangle\end{aligned}$$

respectively. Here $\lambda_I^q=(\lambda_{i_q i})_{i\in I}$ with $\lambda_{i_q i_q}=id_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}$, $\Lambda_I^q=(\Lambda_{i_q i})_{i\in I}$ and each $\Lambda_{i_q i}$ is the lifting of $\lambda_{i_q i}$ as before and thus $\Lambda_{i_q i_q}=id_{\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}}$. So we have transition functions

$$\begin{aligned}&(\widehat{\lambda_I^l})^{-1}\circ\widehat{\lambda_I^q}:\widetilde{O}_{i_q}\to\widetilde{O}_{i_l},\ \tilde{x}\mapsto\lambda_{i_q i_l}(\tilde{x}),\\&(\widehat{\Lambda_I^l})^{-1}\circ\widehat{\Lambda_I^q}:\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}\to\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_l}},\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\Lambda_{i_q i_l}(\tilde{\xi}).\end{aligned}$$

This, (2.109) and (2.110) for $i=i_q, j=i_l$ together imply that the orientation of $\widehat{S}_I|_{\widehat{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^1}(\widetilde{O}_{i_1})}$ given by the above one of $\widetilde{S}_{i_1}$ agree with (on their overlaps) those of $\widehat{S}_I|_{\widehat{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^q}(\widetilde{O}_{i_q})}$ given by the ones of $\widetilde{S}_{i_q}$, $q=1,\cdots,n$.

Moreover, for $\hat{u}'_I\in\hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(O)$ and a small connected open neighborhood O' of u'_I in $W_I^\circ=\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{W}_I^\circ)$ and $\widetilde{O}'_{i_l}=\pi_{i_l}^{-1}(O')$, $l=1,\cdots,k$, we have the corresponding charts

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\lambda_I'^l}:\widetilde{O}'_{i_l}\to\widehat{W}_I,\ \tilde{x}\mapsto[\tilde{u}_I,1_I,\lambda_I'^l(\tilde{x})],\\&\widehat{\Lambda_I'^l}:\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_l}}\to\widehat{E}_I,\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\langle\tilde{u}_I,1_I,\Lambda_I'^l(\tilde{\xi})\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\pi_{i_q}^{-1}(O'\cap O)=\widetilde{O}'_{i_q}\cap\widetilde{O}_{i_q}$ and that both $\lambda_{i_q i_l}$ both $\lambda'_{i_q i_l}$ are diffeomorphisms from $\widetilde{O}'_{i_q}\cap\widetilde{O}_{i_q}$ to $\widetilde{O}'_{i_l}\cap\widetilde{O}_{i_l}$, $q,l=1,\cdots,k$. Using the fact that $\pi_{i_l}\circ\lambda_{i_q i_l}=\pi_{i_q}$ and $\pi_{i_l}\circ\lambda'_{i_q i_l}=\pi_{i_q}$ we derive that

$$\lambda_{i_q i_l}=\lambda'_{i_q i_l}\text{ on }\widetilde{O}'_{i_q}\cap\widetilde{O}_{i_q}\quad\text{and}\quad\Lambda_{i_q i_l}=\Lambda'_{i_q i_l}\text{ on }\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_q}\cap\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}$$

for any $q, l = 1, \cdots, k$. In particular, we have

$$(\widehat{\lambda'^1_I})^{-1} \circ \widehat{\lambda^1_I} : \widetilde{O}'_{i_1} \cap \widetilde{O}_{i_1} \to \widetilde{O}'_{i_1} \cap \widetilde{O}_{i_1}, \ \tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{x},$$
$$(\widehat{\Lambda'^1_I})^{-1} \circ \widehat{\Lambda^1_I} : \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_1} \cap \widetilde{O}_{i_1}} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\widetilde{O}'_{i_1} \cap \widetilde{O}_{i_1}}, \ \tilde{\xi} \mapsto \tilde{\xi}.$$

It follows from these and the above arguments that the orientation of $\widehat{S}_I$ defined as above is independent of choices of the coordinate charts.

Finally we show that for any $I, J \in \mathcal{N}$ with $J \subset I$ the covering projection $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ preserves the orientation that we just defined. In fact, using the local expression of $\widehat{S}_I$ in (2.52) the relation in (2.64) may be written as

$$\tilde{S}_{j_1} \circ \lambda_{i_1 j_1} = \Lambda_{i_1 j_1} \circ \tilde{S}_{i_1}.$$

So it follows from (2.110) that $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ is orientation preserving for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. That is, there exists a positive continuous function $f_{IJ} : \widehat{W}_I \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\det(\hat{\Pi}^I_J)\bigl(o(\widehat{S}_I)(\hat{x})\bigr) = f_{IJ}(\hat{\pi}^I_J(\hat{x})) \cdot o(\widehat{S}_J)\bigl(\pi^I_J(\hat{x})\bigr)$$

for any $\hat{x} \in (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{W}_J)$. The proof is completed. □

2.6 Virtual Euler cycle and class

Assume that X is as in Section 2.5. Let (X, E, S) be an oriented Banach Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. Then we have a family of compatible oriented manifolds $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \bigl\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) : I \in \mathcal{N}\bigr\}$, $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$ to satisfy Corollary 2.39, Proposition 2.40, Proposition 2.42 and Proposition 2.44. However, in order to use the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ to construct a cycle we also assume that (X, E, S) satisfies the following:

Assumption 2.45 Each $x \in X^{sing} \cap Z(S)$ has singularity of codimension at least two. More precisely, for some Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma, \pi)$ at centred at x, i.e. $\pi^{-1}(x) = \{\tilde{x}\}$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\tilde{x}}$, if 1 is an eigenvalue of the linearization of any $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{\mathbb{1}\}$, $dg(\tilde{x}) : T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W} \to T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}$ then the corresponding eigenspace $\mathrm{Ker}(dg(\tilde{x}) - \mathbb{1})$ has codimension at least two.

Clearly this assumption is weaker than the condition that X is 2-regular near $Z(S)$. The Assumption 2.45 is automatically satisfied if X is either an oriented orbifold of finite dimension or a complex Banach orbifold. On the other hand there exist examples of oriented Banach Fredholm bundles not to satisfy Assumption 2.45. For example, let $\widetilde{X} = \mathbb{R} \times S^n$, $\widetilde{E} = \widetilde{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{\mathbb{1}, e\}$ acts on them by

$$e \cdot (t, x) = (-t, x) \quad \text{and} \quad e \cdot (t, x; t') = (-t, x; -t').$$

Let the section $\widetilde{S} : \widetilde{X} \to \widetilde{E}$ be given by $(t, x) \mapsto (t, x; t)$. Then $Z(\widetilde{S}) = \{0\} \times S^n$ and $X^{sing} = \{0\} \times S^n$. Let $X = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$, $E = \widetilde{E}/\Gamma$ and $S : X \to E$ be the natural descent of $\widetilde{S}$. One can check that (X, E, S) is an orientable Banach

Fredholm bundle with compact zero locus. However, each $x \in X^{sing} \cap Z(S)$ has singularity of codimension one.

Now under Assumption 2.45 we can require that each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$ is an open and dense in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and that the singular set $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^{sing}$ is contained in a subvariety of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ of codimension two. It follows that for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ the map

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ$$

is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold regular smooth covering preserving orientation. As in [LiuT1], for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ we take an increasing sequence of compact submanifolds with boundary of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$, $\{\widehat{K}^p_I\}_{p=1}^\infty$, and choose a triangulation of each $\widehat{K}^p_I$ such that:

(i) $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ = \cup_{p=1}^\infty \widehat{K}^p_I$.

(ii) For each simplex $c^p_I \in \widehat{K}^p_I$, $\hat{\pi}^I_J(c^p_I)$ is a simplex of $\widehat{K}^p_J$ provided that $J \subset I$ and $\widehat{K}^p_J \cap \hat{\pi}^I_J(\widehat{K}^p_I) \neq \emptyset$.

(iii) If $q > p$, $\widehat{K}^q_I|_{\widehat{K}^p_I}$ is obtained from $\widehat{K}^p_I$ by some divisions as simplicial complex.

For each simplex in $\widehat{K}^p_I$ of dimension $r = \mathrm{Ind}(S)$ we give it an orientation induced from that of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$, and then take the summation of them to get an integral chain in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$, denoted by $S(\widehat{K}^p_I)$. Let

$$\widehat{S}(\widehat{K}^p_I) := \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\hat{\pi}_I \circ S(\widehat{K}^p_I)$$

be the corresponding smooth singular rational chain in X. All these $\widehat{S}(\widehat{K}^p_I)$, $I \in \mathcal{N}$, form a smooth singular rational chain in X,

$$C(\widehat{K}^p) := \text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\,\widehat{S}(\widehat{K}^p_I).$$

Here the summation is put in double quotation marks because we only count them once on those overlaps where more than one singular maps appear. Let $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ denote the inverse limit of $\{C(\widehat{K}^p)\}_p$. It is a rational singular chain in X of dimension r. We also formally write it as

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} := \text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\,\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\big\{\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ \to X\big\} \tag{2.111}$$

for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ if no confusion occurs, where $\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$ is put in double quotation marks in (2.111) because of the same reason as above. We call $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ a **virtual Euler chain** of the triple (X,E,S).

If X has boundary and $\partial X \cap Z(S) \neq \emptyset$, then it is possible that

$$\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ := \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(\partial X) \neq \emptyset.$$

In this case, for any $J \subset I$ the covering $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ also restricts to a regular one

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \cap \partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ.$$

We can require that the above triangulation is compatible with these boundaries. Namely, the triangulation is an extension of a given triangulation of the family $\{\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$. Then the corresponding singular rational chain in ∂X constructed from the latter is exactly the boundary of $C(\widehat{K}^p_I)$,

$$\partial C(\widehat{K}^p)=\text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\partial\widehat{S}(\widehat{K}^p_I)=\text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\hat{\pi}_I\circ\partial S(\widehat{K}^p_I).$$

We later write it as

$$\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}=\text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\big\{\hat{\pi}_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ\to\partial X\big\}$$

without special statements. Consequently, we get:

Claim 2.46 *If X has no 2-boundary ∂_2X then the class $[\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}]$ is zero in $H_{r-1}(X,\mathbb{Q})$.*

Actually, for any smooth map f from X to a finite dimensional smooth orbifold M and any closed $(r-1)$-form ω on M with compact support it directly follows from the Stokes theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}}f^*\omega\quad&:=\text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ}(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\omega\\&=\text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ}(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*(d\omega)=0.\end{aligned}$$

Here the properness of $\hat{\pi}_I$ is used.

Claim 2.43 is an analogue of the fact that for an n-dimensional compact oriented manifold (resp. orbifold) M with boundary the boundary ∂M is an $(n-1)$-dimensional manifold (resp. orbifold) with a natural orientation induced from the orientation of M and the image of the fundamental class $[\partial M]$ is zero in $H_{n-1}(M,\mathbb{Z})$ (resp. $H_{n-1}(M,\mathbb{Q})$).

If $Z(S)\subset\mathrm{Int}(X)$ it follows from the above arguments that for $\mathbf{t}$ sufficiently small, $\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}=\emptyset$ and thus $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is a rational singular cycle in X of dimension r. In this case $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is called a **virtual Euler cycle** of the triple (X,E,S). By Proposition 2.40(i)-(ii) and Proposition 2.42(v)-(vi) it is easily seen that the homology class of this cycle is independent of choices of generic small $\mathbf{t}$. Thus the homology class $[e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}]\in H_r(X,\mathbb{Q})$ is well-defined. We call the class

$$e(E,S)=[e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}]\in H_r(X,\mathbb{Q}),\tag{2.112}$$

the **virtual Euler class** of the triple because we shall prove in next two subsections that it is independent of the different choices above.

In Remark 2.43, as singular chains $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ can be identified with $\hat{\pi}:\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ\to X$. Later we shall also write $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}=\{\hat{\pi}:\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ\to X\}$.

An important example of the Banach Fredholm orbibundles is a triple consisting a finitely dimensional orbibundle $p:E\to X$ and a smooth section

$S : X \to E$. As pointed out below (2.1), if X is also orientable it has no singularities of codimension one naturally. In particular, if X is a closed oriented orbifold we may take E to be the tangent orbibundle TX and S to be the zero section. The corresponding Euler class $e(TX, 0)$ becomes a rational number, called the **orbifold Euler characteristic (number)** of X and simply denoted by $e(X)$.

Let P be a smooth orbifold of finite dimension and $f : X \to P$ be a smooth map. Then $f_*(e(E,S)) \in H_r(P,\mathbb{Q})$, and $\langle f_*(e(E,S)), \alpha\rangle \in \mathbb{Q}$ for any $\alpha \in H^r(P,\mathbb{Q})$. Let α^* be a closed differential form representative of it. As usual we have

$$\langle \alpha, f_*(e(E,S))\rangle = \int_{f\circ e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}} \alpha^* = \int_{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}} f^*\alpha^*$$

for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. By the definition of integration over chains it is not hard to check that

$$\int_{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}} f^*\alpha^* = \text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ} (f\circ\hat\pi_I)^*\alpha^*.$$

So we get that for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f^*\alpha, e(E,S)\rangle &= \text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ} (f\circ\hat\pi_I)^*\alpha^* \\ &= \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ} (f\circ\hat\pi)^*\alpha^*.\end{aligned} \tag{2.113}$$

Remark 2.47 If $E \to X$ is a Banach bundle then all groups Γ_i and Γ_I in the arguments above are trivial. In this case each $\hat\pi_I$ (resp. $\hat\Pi^I_J$) is an open embedding (resp. bundle embedding) from Banach manifolds (resp. bundles) $\widehat{W}_I$ (resp. $\widehat{E}_I$) into X (resp. E), and for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ the projection $\hat\pi^I_J$ (resp. $\hat\Pi^I_J$) is an open embedding (resp. bundle embedding) from Banach manifolds $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{W}_I))$ (resp. bundles $\widehat{E}_I|_{(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{W}_J)}$) to $Im(\hat\pi^I_J) \subset \widehat{W}_J$ (resp. $Im(\hat\Pi^I_J) \subset \widehat{E}_J$). So $\widehat{W}_I$ (resp. $\widehat{E}_I$) may be identified an open subset W_I of X (resp. $E|_{W_I} = E_I$), and $\hat\pi^I_J$ (resp. $\hat\Pi^I_J$) is identified with the inclusion $W_I \hookrightarrow W_J$ (resp. $E_I \hookrightarrow E_J$). The systems of Banach bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$ and $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$ actually becomes Banach bundles $E|_W \to W$ and $E|_V \to V$ respectively. Moreover, the global section $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \mid I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$ (resp. $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$) is actually the restriction of the section $S : X \to E$ to W (resp. V). As the global sections of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$, $\hat\sigma_{ij}$ become ones of the Banach bundle $E \to M$ with support in W_i, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$. Finally the virtual Euler cycle $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ in (2.111) becomes the Euler cycle in Section 1. Hence our virtual Euler cycle is a generalization of the Euler cycle in Section 1.

As expected we need to show that the class $e(E,S)$ is independent of the different choices of the sections σ_{ij} and the open sets W_i. It should be first noted that the dependence on choices of the smooth cut-off function γ_i may be reduced to one on choices of sections σ_{ij}. This may be reduced to the cases in the following two subsections. We follow the arguments in [Lu3].

2.6.1 The dependence on choices of sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$

We only need to consider the case in which a section $\sigma_{n(m_n+1)}$ is added to $\{\sigma_{n1},\cdots,\sigma_{nm_n}\}$. Let $m'_n = m_n+1$ and $m'_i = m_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n-1$. Then $m'_1+\cdots+m'_n = m+1$. Replacing the system of Banach bundles in (2.82) and its section in (2.83) we use the system of Banach bundles

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}\times\mathbb{R}^{m+1}\big)\\&=\big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I\times\mathbb{R}^{m+1}), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I\ \big|\ J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

and its corresponding global Fredholm section $\Upsilon' = \{\Upsilon'_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon'_I:\widehat{V}_I\times\mathbb{R}^{m+1}\to\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I,\\&\Big(\hat{x}_I,\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m'_i\\1\le i\le n}}\Big)\mapsto\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m'_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\\&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad=\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m'_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I).\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathbf{P}_1$ is still the projection to the first factor, and $\hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I$ are naturally pullbacks of those projections in (2.72). (Later we shall use these notations without confusion occurs.) By shrinking $\mathcal{W}^*$ and $\varepsilon>0$ in Theorem 2.38 we assume that $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*)$ and $(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1}))$ therein are the corresponding systems of Banach bundles and that $\Upsilon'=\{\Upsilon'_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ is the corresponding section which is **strongly** transversal to the zero section. Then corresponding with the manifold $\widehat{\Omega}_I(s)$ of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+m$ in (2.84) and the projection in (2.86) we have the manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+m+1$,

$$\widehat{\Omega}'_I(S) := \{(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})\in\widehat{V}^*_I\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})\,|\,\Upsilon'_I(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})=0\}$$

and the projection

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J:(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\Omega}'_J(S)\big)\to\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\subset\widehat{\Omega}'_J(S)$$

for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$. Note that for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$ and $(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})\in\widehat{V}^*_I\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})$,

$$\Upsilon'_I\Big(\hat{x}_I,\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m'_i\\1\le i\le n}}\Big)=\Upsilon_I\Big(\hat{x}_I,\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le n}}\Big)+t_{n(m_n+1)}(\hat{\sigma}_{n(m_n+1)})_I(\hat{x}_I)$$

if $n\in I$, and

$$\Upsilon'_I\Big(\hat{x}_I,\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m'_i\\1\le i\le n}}\Big)=\Upsilon_I\Big(\hat{x}_I,\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le n}}\Big)\tag{2.114}$$

if $n\notin I$. Let $t_{n(m_n+1)}$ denote the final coordinate in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ and $\mathbf{t}^{(1)}$ the first m coordinates. It follows from (2.114) that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Upsilon'_I)^{-1}(0)&=\big\{(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})\in\widehat{V}^*_I\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})\,|\,\Upsilon'_I(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})=0\big\}\\&=\big\{(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})\in\widehat{V}^*_I\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})\,|\,\Upsilon_I(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t}^{(1)})=0\big\}\\&=(\Upsilon_I)^{-1}(0)\times(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)\end{aligned}$$

if $n \notin I$. Here Υ_I is as in Theorem 2.38. In this case, by Lemma 1.7 we may choose $\mathbf{t} = (\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, t_{n(m_n+1)}) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})_{res}$ such that $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. So for such a $\mathbf{t}$,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I(s) \times \left\{t_{n(m_n+1)}\right\} \text{ if } n \notin I. \tag{2.115}$$

Here $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) := (\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I(S) = (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}^{(1)})}_I)^{-1}(0)$ is as in Corollary 2.39.

Now let $n \in I$. In order to relate $\widehat{\Omega}'_I(S)$ to $\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ we need to consider the system of Banach bundles

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times [0,1]\big)\\ &= \big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times [0,1]), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

and the Fredholm section $\Phi = \{\Phi_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_I : \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times [0,1] \to \mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I,\\ &\Big(\hat{x}_I, \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m'_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}, s\Big) \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + s \cdot t_{n(m_n+1)}(\hat{\sigma}_{n(m_n+1)})_I(\hat{x}_I)\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad = \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + s \cdot t_{n(m_n+1)}(\hat{\sigma}_{n(m_n+1)})_I(\hat{x}_I).\end{aligned}$$

As in (2.92) we have its trivialization representation:

$$\begin{aligned}&\widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times [0,1] \to (\widetilde{E}_{i_q})_{\tilde{x}_{i_q}},\\ &(\tilde{x}, \mathbf{t}, s) \mapsto S^T_{i_q}(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} t_{i_q j}\sigma^T_{i_q j}(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{i \in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}\tau^{qT}_{ij}(\tilde{x})\\ &\qquad\qquad + s \cdot t_{n(m_n+1)}\sigma^T_{n(m_n+1)}(\tilde{x}).\end{aligned}$$

As in the proofs of Theorem 2.38 and Proposition 2.42, by shrinking $\mathcal{W}^*$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ therein we can prove that the restriction of the section $\Phi = \{\Phi_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ to the system of bundles $\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \times [0,1]\big)$ is **strongly** transversal to the zero section. By Lemma 1.7 we can choose a regular value $\mathbf{t}$ of the projection

$$\mathcal{P}_I : (\Phi_I)^{-1}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^{m+1},\ (\hat{x}, \mathbf{t}, s) \mapsto \mathbf{t},$$

i.e. $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})_{res}$ such that $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. Then the manifold

$$\mathcal{P}_I^{-1}(\mathbf{t}) := \{(\hat{x}, \mathbf{t}, s) \in \widehat{V}^* \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \times [0,1] \,|\, \Phi(\hat{x}, \mathbf{t}, s) = 0\}$$

forms a strong cobordsim between $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and

$$\big\{(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}, 0) \in \mathcal{P}_I^{-1}(\mathbf{t})\big\} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I(S) \times \{t_{n(m_n+1)}\} \approx \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I(S).$$

Combing this and (2.115) we get that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I(S)$ are always strongly cobordant. Clearly, for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ the corresponding projection

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\mathcal{P}_J^{-1}(\mathbf{t})\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \subset \mathcal{P}_J^{-1}(\mathbf{t})$$

also forms a cobordsim between the projection

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_J(S)\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_J(S)$$

and

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}'^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S).$$

Consider the orientation given in Proposition 2.44. The above cobordsims are also oriented ones. In summary we arrive at:

Proposition 2.48 *For different choices of optimal sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$, the corresponding families such as $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ are oriented strongly cobordant, and thus the corresponding singular chains as in (2.110), $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, are* oriented cobordant. *In particular, if $Z(S) \cap \partial X = \emptyset$ then the class $e(E,S)$ is well-defined and is independent of different choices of optimal sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$.*

2.6.2 The dependence on choices of W_i

In this subsection we assume that $Z(S) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$ and Assumption 2.45 is satisfied (so that $e(E,S)$ is well-defined). We only need to consider the case that **an open subset W_{n+1} and the corresponding optimal sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{(n+1)j} = \gamma_{(n+1)j} \cdot \tilde{s}_{(n+1)j}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_{n+1}$, are added.**

The proof can be done as in §4.3 in [Lu3]. Here we shall prove it as a consequence of Claim 2.43 and the restriction principle in Proposition 2.51. By the above we may assume that X has no boundary. Consider the Banach orbifold $X \times [0,1]$ with boundary $\partial(X \times [0,1]) = (X \times \{0\}) \cup (X \times \{1\})$ and natural pullback Fredholm orbibundle $(X \times [0,1], \mathrm{pr}^*E, \mathrm{pr}^*S)$ via the projection to the first factor $\mathrm{pr} : X \times [0,1] \to X$. $(X \times [0,1], \mathrm{pr}^*E, \mathrm{pr}^*S)$ has an orientation induced from one of (X, E, S). Let $Y_i = X \times \{i\}$, $i = 0, 1$. They are Banach suborbifolds of $X \times [0,1]$, and also closed subsets of the latter. Obviously, $(Y_i, (\mathrm{pr}^*E)|_{Y_i}, (\mathrm{pr}^*S)|_{Y_i})$, $i = 0,1$ can be identified with (X, E, S). Let $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ be the chosen Banach orbifold charts centred at $x_i \in Z(S)$ on X, $i = 1, \cdots, n+1$ such that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W_i$ and $\cap_{i=1}^n W_i = \emptyset$. Suppose also that $(\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n+1$ are the corresponding orbibundle charts on them. As before let pairs of open sets $W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j$, $i = 1, \cdots, n+1$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, be such that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W_i^1$ and

$$U_i^1 \subset\subset W_i^2 \subset\subset U_i^2 \cdots \subset\subset W_i^n \subset\subset U_i^n \subset\subset W_i.$$

For $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $j = 1, \cdots, n+1$ denote by

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\widetilde{W}'_i = \widetilde{W}_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}), & W'_i = W_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}), & \pi'_i = \pi_i \times \mathbf{1}, \\
\widetilde{W}'_{n+j} = \widetilde{W}_j \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1], & W'_{n+j} = W_j \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1], & \pi'_{n+j} = \pi_j \times \mathbf{1}, \\
\Gamma'_i = \{g \times \mathbf{1} \,|\, g \in \Gamma_i\}, & \Gamma'_{n+j} = \{g \times \mathbf{1} \,|\, g \in \Gamma_j\}, & \\
\widetilde{E}'_i = p_i^* \widetilde{E}_i, & E'_i = (\mathrm{pr}^*E)|_{W'_i}, & p_i : \widetilde{W}_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}) \to \widetilde{W}_i, \\
\widetilde{E}'_{n+j} = q_j^* \widetilde{E}_j, & E'_{n+j} = (\mathrm{pr}^*E)|_{W'_{n+j}}, & q_j : \widetilde{W}_j \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1] \to \widetilde{W}_j,
\end{array}$$

where all p_i, q_j are the projections to the first factors. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} &= \{I \subset \{1, \cdots, n\} \,|\, W_I = \cap_{i \in I} W_i \neq \emptyset\},\\
\mathcal{N}'' &= \{I \subset \{1, \cdots, n+1\} \,|\, W_I = \cap_{i \in I} W_i \neq \emptyset\},\\
\mathcal{N}' &= \{I \subset \{1, \cdots, 2n+1\} \,|\, W'_I = \cap_{i \in I} W'_i \neq \emptyset\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then each $I \in \mathcal{N}'$ contains at most $2n-2$ elements. By Remark 2.32 we only need to take pairs of open sets

$$W_i'^j \subset\subset U_i'^j, \; i = 1, \cdots, 2n+1, j = 1, 2, \cdots, 2n-2,$$

such that $Z(S) \times [0,1] \subset \cup_{i=1}^{2n+1} W_i'^1$ and

$$U_i'^1 \subset\subset W_i'^2 \subset\subset U_i'^2 \cdots \subset\subset W_i'^{2n-2} \subset\subset U_i'^{2n-2} \subset\subset W'_i.$$

Clearly, for a very small positive $\eta < \frac{1}{100}$ one can require that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_i^j \times [0, \eta) &= (X \times [0, \eta]) \cap W_i'^j,\\
U_i^j \times [0, \eta) &= (X \times [0, \eta]) \cap U_i'^j,
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$, and that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_i^j \times (1-\eta, 1] &= (X \times [1-\eta, 1]) \cap W_{n+i}'^j,\\
U_i^j \times (1-\eta, 1] &= (X \times [1-\eta, 1]) \cap U_{n+i}'^j
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n+1$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$. These imply that

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{W}_i'^j \cap (\pi'_i)^{-1}(W'_i) = W_i^j \times [0, \eta),\\
&\widetilde{U}_i'^j \cap (\pi'_i)^{-1}(W'_i) = U_i^j \times [0, \eta),\\
&Cl(U_i^j) \times \{0\} = (X \times \{0\}) \cap Cl(U_i'^j)
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.116}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$, and that

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{W}_{i+n}'^j \cap (\pi'_{i+n})^{-1}(W'_{i+n}) = W_i^j \times (1-\eta, 1],\\
&\widetilde{U}_{i+n}'^j \cap (\pi'_{i+n})^{-1}(W'_{i+n}) = U_i^j \times (1-\eta, 1],\\
&Cl(U_i^j) \times \{1\} = (X \times \{1\}) \cap Cl(U_{n+i}'^j)
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.117}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n+1$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$.

Let γ_k, $k = 1, \cdots, n+1$, are the corresponding smooth cut-off functions on $\widetilde{W}_k$ as given by (2.77). One can take Γ'_k-invariant smooth cut-off functions γ'_k on $\widetilde{W}'_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n+1$ such that:

- $\gamma'_k(x, 0) = \gamma_k(x)$, $\forall (x, 0) \in \widetilde{W}'_k$ and $k = 1, \cdots, n$;
- $\gamma'_k(x, 1) = \gamma_{k-n}(x)$, $\forall (x, 1) \in \widetilde{W}'_k$ and $k = n+1, \cdots, 2n+1$;
- $\widetilde{U}_k'^0 := \{e \in \widetilde{W}'_k \mid \gamma'_k(e) > 0\} \subset\subset \widetilde{W}'_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n+1$;
- $\cup_{k=1}^{2n+1} U_k'^0 \supset Z(S) \times [0,1]$, where $U_k'^0 := \pi'_k(\widetilde{U}_k'^0)$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n+1$.

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&U'^0_k\cap(W_k\times\{0\})=U^0_k\times\{0\},\quad k=1,\cdots,n,\\&U'^0_{n+k}\cap(W_k\times\{1\})=U^0_k\times\{1\},\ k=1,\cdots,n+1.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde\sigma_{ij}=\gamma_i\cdot\tilde s_{ij}$ be the (optimal) sections of the bundle $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$ as in (2.79), $i=1,\cdots,n+1$ and $j=1,\cdots,m_i$. Then the sections of the bundle $\widetilde{E}'_k\to\widetilde{W}'_k$,

$$\tilde\sigma'_{kj}(x,t)=\gamma'_k(x,t)\cdot\tilde s_{kj}(x)\quad\forall\,(x,t)\in\widetilde{W}'_k,$$

$k=1,\cdots,n, j=1,\cdots,m_k$, and ones of the bundle $\widetilde{E}'_{n+k}\to\widetilde{W}'_{n+k}$,

$$\tilde\sigma'_{(n+k)j}(x,t)=\gamma'_{n+k}(x,t)\cdot\tilde s_{kj}(x)\quad\forall(x,t)\in\widetilde{W}'_{n+k},$$

$k=1,\cdots,n+1, j=1,\cdots,m_k$, form a optimal family, and these $m':=m+m''$ sections satisfy the corresponding properties with (2.104). Here

$$m=\sum_{i=1}^n m_i\quad\text{and}\quad m''=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}m_i.$$

Let $\mathcal{W}'^*$ be a small open neighborhood $Z(p_1^*S)=Z(S)\times[0,1]$ in $X\times[0,1]$ such that $Z(S)\times[0,1]\subset\cup_{k=1}^{2n+1}U'^0_k$. As usual we can use all these data to construct a family of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of $(X\times[0,1],\mathrm{pr}^*E,\mathrm{pr}^*S)$,

$$e(\mathrm{pr}^*E,\mathrm{pr}^*S)^{\mathbf{t}'}=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(\mathrm{pr}^*S)^\circ\to X\times[0,1]\}$$

for $\mathbf{t}'=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le 2n+1}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$. Clearly, we can write $\mathbf{t}'=(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}'')$,

$$\mathbf{t}:=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le n}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\quad\text{and}\quad\mathbf{t}'':=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\n+1\le i\le 2n+1}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m''}).$$

Note that the boundary of $e(\mathrm{pr}^*E,\mathrm{pr}^*S)^{\mathbf{t}'}$,

$$\partial e(\mathrm{pr}^*E,\mathrm{pr}^*S)^{\mathbf{t}'}=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(\mathrm{pr}^*S)^\circ\to\partial(X\times[0,1])\},$$

is equal to $\triangle(0,\mathbf{t})\cup(-\triangle(1,\mathbf{t}''))$. Here

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle(0,\mathbf{t})&=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(\mathrm{pr}^*S)^\circ\cap(\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(X\times\{0\})\to X\times\{0\}\}\\&=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(\mathrm{pr}^*S)^\circ\cap(\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(X\times\{0\})\to X\times\{0\}\},\\\triangle(1,\mathbf{t}'')&=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(\mathrm{pr}^*S)^\circ\cap(\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(X\times\{1\})\to X\times\{1\}\}\\&=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}^*}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(\mathrm{pr}^*S)^\circ\cap(\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(X\times\{1\})\to X\times\{1\}\},\end{aligned}$$

where (2.116) and (2.117) are used, and

$$\mathcal{N}^* = \{I \in \mathcal{N}' \mid \max I > n\} = \{J + n \mid J \in \mathcal{N}''\}.$$

Let $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ and $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}''}$ be respectively the virtual Euler cycles of (X,E,S) constructed from the following data of two groups

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{W}^* := \{x \in X \,|\, (x,0) \in \mathcal{W}'^* \cap (X \times \{0\})\},\ \{W_i\}_{i=1}^n, \\ \{\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}},\ \{W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j\}_{\substack{1\le i\le n\\ 1\le j\le n-1}},\ \mathbf{t} := \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \end{array}\right.$$

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{W}''^* := \{x \in X \,|\, (x,1) \in \mathcal{W}'^* \cap (X \times \{0\})\},\ \{W_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}, \\ \{\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n+1}},\ \{W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j\}_{\substack{1\le i\le n+1\\ 1\le j\le n}}),\ \mathbf{t} := \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n+1}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m''}). \end{array}\right.$$

Then by the above choices and the restriction principle in Proposition 2.51 one easily checks that $\triangle(0,\mathbf{t})$ (resp. $\triangle(1,\mathbf{t}'')$) can be exactly identified with the virtual Euler cycle $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ (resp. $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}''}$). So Claim 2.43 yields

$$\begin{aligned} [e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}] - [e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}''}] &= [e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}] + [-e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}''}] \\ &= [\triangle(0,\mathbf{t})] + [-\triangle(1,\mathbf{t}'')] \\ &= [\triangle(0,\mathbf{t}) \cup (-\triangle(1,\mathbf{t}''))] \\ &= [\partial e(\mathrm{pr}^*E, \mathrm{pr}^*S)^{\mathbf{t}'}] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result is proved.

From our above result one easily derives that $e(E,S)$ is independent of concrete choices of the cut-off functions γ_k and pairs of open sets $W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j$.

Remark 2.49 If we only assume that X is 1-regular, the affectivity arguments in Claim 2.16 is not needed, and Claim 2.23 still holds true. In this case, after some numbers such as $|\Gamma_I|$, $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_i)|$ are replaced by

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} |\Gamma_i| - |\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_i, \widetilde{W}_i)| + 1 & \text{if } I = \{i\}, \\ \prod_{s=1}^k (|\Gamma_{i_s}| - |\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_{i_s}, \widetilde{W}_{i_s})| + 1) & \text{if } I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}, \end{array}\right.$$

$$|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_i)| - |\mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma(\tilde{u}_i), \widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_i))| + 1,$$

respectively, all arguments in this subsection and next two subsections are all true. We leave them to reader for checking.

2.7 Localization formula and restriction principle

Motivated by the localization formula in §5 of [Lu3] we here shall give two abstract versions of them. The second one is given as a consequence of a restriction principle. Without special statements, **all Banach orbifolds are also supposed to be 1-regular and effective, and all Banach Fredholm orbibundles are oriented, have compact zero loci and also satisfy Assumption 2.45.** (Remark 2.49 is still effective.) In particular, (X,E,S) denote an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle of index r

and with compact zero set $Z(S)$, and satisfy $Z(S) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X)$ and Assumption 2.45. Another approach to localization in symplectic geometry was presented in [Chen].

Let $\Lambda \subset Z(S)$ be a nonempty compact subset. In the construction of the above virtual Euler cycle of (X, E, S) if one only requires:
(i) the finitely many points x_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ belong to Λ,
(ii) $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an open cover of Λ,
(iii) $\mathcal{W}^*$ is an open neighborhood of Λ contained in $\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$, denoted by $\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)$,
then we get the corresponding systems of Banach bundles,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(\Lambda), \widehat{W}(\Lambda)\big) &:= \big\{\big(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{W}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\\
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\Lambda), \widehat{V}(\Lambda)\big) &:= \big\{\big(\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\\
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*(\Lambda), \widehat{V}^*(\Lambda)\big) &:= \big\{\big(\widehat{F}^*_I, \widehat{V}^*_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where V_I, $\widehat{V}_I$, $\widehat{F}_I$ (resp. V^*_I, $\widehat{V}^*_I$, $\widehat{F}^*_I$) are defined by (2.65) and (2.66) (resp. (2.71)). These are called the **Banach bundle systems of** (X, E, S) **relative to** Λ. Corresponding with (2.93) we have a family of Fredholm sections of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*(\Lambda), \widehat{V}^*(\Lambda)\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}(\Lambda) = \{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$, where $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and the section $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda) : \widehat{V}^*_I \to \widehat{F}^*_I$ is given by

$$\hat{x}_I \mapsto \Upsilon_I(\tilde{x}, \mathbf{t}) = \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I).$$

Moreover, there exists a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res}$ the global section $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}(\Lambda)$ is strongly transversal to the zero section. So we get a family of strongly cobordant rational chains near Λ of dimension r, denoted by

$$e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}_\Lambda := \text{``}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \{\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S, \Lambda)^\circ \to X\}, \forall \mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res}.$$

They are called **virtual Euler chains relative to** Λ of the triple (X, E, S). Here $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S, \Lambda) := (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda))^{-1}(0)$ is a manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ and with compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I) \subset \widehat{V}^+_I$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S, \Lambda)^\circ$ is the regular part of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S, \Lambda)$. Clearly, if $Z(S)$ is compact then for any compact subset $\Lambda \subset Z(S)$ one may view $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ as virtual Euler chains of (X, E, S) relative to Λ. As below (2.112) we can also define $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S, \Lambda)$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S, \Lambda)^\circ$ and identify $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}_\Lambda$ with $\hat{\pi} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S, \Lambda)^\circ \to X$.

Proposition 2.50 *(***First localization formula***). Let P be a smooth orbifold of finite dimension and $f : X \to P$ be a smooth map. If $\alpha \in H^r(P, \mathbb{R})$ has a closed differential form representative α^* such that the sup-*

port $\mathrm{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)$ *of* $f^*\alpha^*$ *is contained in* Λ*, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f^*\alpha, e(E,S)\rangle &= \int_{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Lambda}} f^*\alpha^* \\ &:= \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)^{\circ}} (f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\alpha^* \\ &= \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S,\Lambda)^{\circ}} (f\circ\hat{\pi})^*\alpha^*\end{aligned}$$

for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^{\star}_{res}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^{\Lambda}_{res}$*. Here* $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^{\star}_{res}$ *is also a residual subset in* $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$*, and* $\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$ *is put in double quotation marks because of the same reason as before, i.e. the repeating part is only counted once.*

Proof. Recall the construction of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Lambda}$. We have chosen pairs of open sets $W_i^j\subset\subset U_i^j$ such that

$$W_i^1\subset\subset U_i^1\subset\subset W_i^2\subset\subset U_i^2\cdots\subset\subset W_i^{n-1}\subset\subset U_i^{n-1}\subset\subset W_i,$$

$i=1,\cdots,n$, $j=1,\cdots,n-1$. For each $i=1,\cdots,n$, let $\tilde{\sigma}_{il}=\gamma_i\cdot\tilde{s}_{il}$ be the chosen optimal sections with support in $\widetilde{W}_i^1$, $l=1,\cdots,m_i$, and $\widetilde{U}_i^0=\{\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{W}_i\,|\,\gamma_i(\tilde{x})>0\}$ and $U_i^0=\pi_i(\widetilde{U}_i)$.

Fix a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0$ of Λ in X so that

$$\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0\subset\subset\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda).$$

Here $\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)$ is a small open neighborhood of Λ contained in $\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$. Since $Z(S)\setminus\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)$ is compact we may furthermore take finite many points $x_i\in Z(S)\setminus\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)$ and the corresponding orbifold charts $(\widetilde{W}_i,\Gamma_i,\pi_i)$ centred at x_i in X, $i=n+1,\cdots,n'$ such that

$$Z(S)\setminus\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)\subset\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_2\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_2\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0=\emptyset\tag{2.118}$$

for $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_2:=\cup_{i=n+1}^{n'}W_i=\cup_{i=n+1}^{n'}\pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i)$. Of course we have also the corresponding orbibundle charts $(\widetilde{E}_i,\Gamma_i,\Pi_i)$, $i=n+1,\cdots,n'$. Furthermore we choose pairs of open sets $W_i^j\subset\subset U_i^j$, $i=1,\cdots,n$, $j=n,\cdots,n'-1$, and $W_k^l\subset\subset U_k^l$, $k=n+1,\cdots,n'$, $l=1,\cdots,n'-1$ such that

$$W_i^1\subset\subset U_i^1\subset\subset W_i^2\subset\subset U_i^2\cdots\subset\subset W_i^{n'-1}\subset\subset U_i^{n'-1}\subset\subset W_i,$$

$i=1,\cdots,n'$, $j=1,\cdots,n'-1$. By (2.118) we can require that

$$Z(S)\setminus\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)\subset\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_2'\quad\text{for}\quad\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_2':=\cup_{i=n+1}^{n'}W_i^1.$$

So for each $i=n+1,\cdots,n'$, we can take Γ_i-invariant smooth cut-off function $\gamma_i:\widetilde{W}_i\to[0,1]$ with support in $\widetilde{W}_i^1$, and smooth sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{il}=\gamma_i\cdot\tilde{s}_{il}$, $l=1,\cdots,m_i$, such that

$$Z(S)\setminus\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)\subset\cup_{i=n+1}^{n'}U_i^0\quad\text{for}\quad\widetilde{U}_i^0=\{\tilde{x}\in\widetilde{W}_i\,|\,\gamma_i(\tilde{x})>0\},\tag{2.119}$$

and that all sections $\tilde\sigma_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n'$, are optimal for (X, E, S). Denote by $\mathcal{N}'$ the collection of all subsets I of $\{1, \cdots, n'\}$ such that $W_I := \cap_{i\in I} W_i \ne \emptyset$. Then we have a system of Banach bundles,

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}', \widehat{W}'\big) := \big\{\big(\widehat{E}'_I, \widehat{W}'_I\big), \hat\pi'_I, \hat\Pi'_I, \Gamma'_I, \hat\pi'^I_J, \hat\Pi'^I_J, \lambda'^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\}.$$

It is easily checked that for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\big(\widehat{E}'_I, \widehat{W}'_I\big) = \big(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{W}_I\big),\ \hat\pi'_I = \hat\pi_I,\ \hat\Pi'_I = \hat\Pi_I,\\ \Gamma'_I = \Gamma_I,\ \hat\pi'^I_J = \hat\pi^I_J,\ \hat\Pi'^I_J = \hat\Pi^I_J,\ \lambda'^I_J = \lambda^I_J.\end{array}\right\} \tag{2.120}$$

Following (2.65), for each $I \in \mathcal{N}'$ with $|I| = k$ we define

$$V'_I := \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W^k_i\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} \big(\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U^k_j)\big)\Big).$$

Since $\cap^n_{i=1} W_i = \emptyset$, then $V'_I = W^{|I|}_I$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}'$ containing $\{1, \cdots, n\}$. Note that $V'_I \subset V_I$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ in general. Setting $\widehat{V}'_I = \hat\pi^{-1}_I(V'_I)$ and $\widehat{F}'_I = \widehat{E}'_I|_{\widehat{V}'_I}$ we get the renormalization of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}', \widehat{W}'\big)$,

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}', \widehat{V}'\big) := \big\{\big(\widehat{F}'_I, \widehat{V}'_I\big), \hat\pi'_I, \hat\Pi'_I, \Gamma'_I, \hat\pi'^I_J, \hat\Pi'^I_J, \lambda'^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\}.$$

By (2.119) one can take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $Z(S)$ in X so small that

$$\mathcal{W}^* \subset \mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda) \cup (\cup^{n'}_{i=n+1} U^0_i).$$

Setting $V'^*_I = V'_I \cap \mathcal{W}^*$, $\widehat{V}'^*_I = (\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(V'^*_I)$ and $\widehat{F}'^*_I = \widehat{F}'_I|_{\widehat{V}'^*_I}$ we get the restriction of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}', \widehat{V}'\big)$ to $\mathcal{W}^*$,

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'^*, \widehat{V}'^*\big) := \big\{\big(\widehat{F}'^*_I, \widehat{V}'^*_I\big), \hat\pi'_I, \hat\Pi'_I, \Gamma_I, \hat\pi'^I_J, \hat\Pi'^I_J, \lambda'^I_J \bigm| J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\}.$$

By shrinking $\mathcal{W}^*$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we have a family of sections of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'^*, \widehat{V}'^*\big)$ that are strongly transversal to the zero section, $\Upsilon^{\mathbf{t}'} = \{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}'\}$,

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I : \widehat{V}'^*_I \to \widehat{F}'^*_I,\ \hat x_I \mapsto \Upsilon_I(\tilde x, \mathbf{t}') = \hat S'_I(\hat x_I) + \sum^k_{i=1}\sum^{m_i}_{j=1} t_{ij}(\hat\sigma'_{ij})_I(\hat x_I),$$

where $\mathbf{t}' = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le l}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$ and $m' = \sum^{n'}_{i=1} m_i$. These yield a family of cobordant virtual Euler cycles of dimension r,

$$e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}'} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ \to X\}\ \forall \mathbf{t}' \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) = (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I)^{-1}(0)$. Note that

$$\langle f^*\alpha, e(E, S)\rangle = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ}(\hat\pi'_I \circ f)^*\alpha^*$$

for any $\mathbf{t}' \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$. By Lemma 1.7 the set

$$\Big\{\mathbf{t}=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\ \Big|\ \mathbf{t}'=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n'}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}\Big\}$$

is a residual subset in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Let $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\star_{res}$ be the intersection of it and $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res}$, which is also a residual subset in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Then for each $\mathbf{t}=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\star_{res}$ one may take a $\mathbf{t}'\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$ of form $\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n'}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$. So it suffice to prove that

$$\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ}(\hat{\pi}'_I\circ f)^*\alpha^* = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)^\circ}(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\alpha^*$$

for such $\mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{t}'$ very small. To this end note that the second condition in (2.118) implies

$$\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ}(\hat{\pi}'_I\circ f)^*\alpha^*=0$$

if $I\in\mathcal{N}'$ contains a number in $\{n+1,\cdots,n'\}$ because the support $\operatorname{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)$ of $f^*\alpha^*$ is contained in Λ. So we only need to prove that

$$\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ}(\hat{\pi}'_I\circ f)^*\alpha^* = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)^\circ}(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\alpha^*. \quad (2.121)$$

For any $I\in\mathcal{N}$, it is clear that $\widehat{V}'_I\subset\widehat{V}_I$ and $\widehat{F}'^*_I=\widehat{F}^*_I|_{\widehat{V}'_I}$. Moreover, by (2.70), $(\hat{\sigma}'_{ij})_I=0$ for any $i>n$. So $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I$ is equal to the restriction of $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I$ to $\widehat{V}'^*_I$. From these it follows that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)\subset\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)\quad\text{and}\quad\hat{\pi}_I|_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)}=\hat{\pi}'_I. \quad (2.122)$$

Moreover, for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$ it is also easily seen that the inclusion and restriction in (2.122) are compatible with the projections

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\pi}^I_J:(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S,\Lambda)\big)\to\operatorname{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\subset\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S,\Lambda)\quad\text{and}\\&\hat{\pi}'^I_J:(\hat{\pi}'^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_J(S)\big)\to\operatorname{Im}(\hat{\pi}'^I_J)\subset\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_J(S).\end{aligned}$$

Note also that (2.119) and the second condition in (2.118) implies

$$\hat{\pi}_I\Big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)\Big)\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0\subset\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{V}_I\setminus\widehat{V}'_I)\cap\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0=\emptyset$$

for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$. Then the desired result (2.121) follows from these, (2.120) and the fact that $\operatorname{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)\subset\Lambda\subset\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)_0$. $\square$

Similar to the arguments above Proposition 1.12, for a connected component Λ of $Z(S)$ we choose the above neighborhood $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$ of Λ such that $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)\cap(Z(S)\setminus\Lambda)=\emptyset$, and then get a family of cobordant cycles $\{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_\Lambda\,|\,\mathbf{t}\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\}$ and corresponding homology class in $e(E,S)_\Lambda\in H_r(X,\mathbb{Q})$. If Λ_i, $i=1,\cdots,p$, are all connected components of Λ, then

$$e(E,S)=\sum_{i=1}^p e(E,S)_{\Lambda_i}.$$

This easily follows from the following result.

Proposition 2.51 *(***The restriction principle***). Let (X, E, S) be an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle with compact zero locus. Assume that a closed subset $Y \subset X$ is a Banach suborbifold of finite positive codimension. Then $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is also an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle with compact zero locus, and there exist a family of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple (X, E, S),*

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}'} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}'}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ \to X\}\ \forall \mathbf{t}' \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res},$$

and that of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$,

$$e(E|_Y, S|_Y)^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi^y_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)^\circ \to Y\}\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m})_{res},$$

such that $m < m'$, $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{N}'$, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap \hat\pi_I^{-1}(Y) = \emptyset$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}' \setminus \mathcal{N}$, and that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap \hat\pi_I^{-1}(Y),\\ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)^\circ = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ \cap \hat\pi_I^{-1}(Y),\\ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)^{sing} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^{sing} \cap \hat\pi_I^{-1}(Y),\\ \hat\pi^{yI}_J = \hat\pi^I_J|_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)},\end{array}\right\} \tag{2.123}$$

for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $J \subset I$, and

$$\mathbf{t}' = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n'}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{t} := \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}.$$

Consequently, for such $\mathbf{t}'$ and $\mathbf{t}$ it holds that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y)^\circ = \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ \cap \hat\pi^{-1}(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat\pi^y = \hat\pi|_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y)^\circ}. \tag{2.124}$$

In this case we say $e(E|_Y, S|_Y)^{\mathbf{t}}$ to be the intersection of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}'}$ with Y, or the restriction of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}'}$ to Y.

Proof. Since $Z(S)$ is compact and Y is closed in X, the zero locus $Z(S|_Y) = Z(S)\cap Y$ is also a compact subset in Y. One can check that Assumption 2.45 also holds for the suborbifold Y. By the definition of the suborbifold in Section 2.1 we can choose finitely many points

$$\begin{gathered} x_i \in Z(S|_Y), i = 1, \cdots, n,\\ x_i \in Z(S) \setminus Z(S|_Y), i = n+1, \cdots, n' \end{gathered}$$

and orbifold charts $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ on X centered at x_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n'$ such that:

(1°) For each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ there exists a submanifold $\widetilde{W}^y_i \subset \widetilde{W}_i$ that is stable under Γ_i and compatible with the inclusion map, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{W}^y_i, \Gamma^y_i, \pi^y_i) = (\widetilde{W}^y_i, \Gamma_i|_{\widetilde{W}^y_i}, \pi_i|_{\widetilde{W}^y_i})$ is a Banach orbifold chart on Y, and thus $W^y_i := \pi_i(\widetilde{W}^y_i) = W_i \cap Y$. (*Warning*: $\Gamma^y_i = \Gamma_i$ as abstract groups. Thus later we also write Γ^y_i as Γ_i without danger of confusions.)

(2°) $\{W_i^y = \pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i^y)\}_{i=1}^n$ is an open cover of $Z(S|_Y)$ with $\cap_{i=1}^n W_i^y = \emptyset$, and $\{W_i = \pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n'}$ is an open cover of $Z(S)$ in X with $\cap_{i=1}^{n'} W_i = \emptyset$.

(3°) For $i = n+1, \cdots, n'$, $W_i = \pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i)$ are disjoint with Y.

Similarly, let $(\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i)$ be the orbifold bundle charts on E corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n'$, then we get such a chart on $E|_Y$,

$$(\widetilde{E}_i^y, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i^y) = (\widetilde{E}_i|_{W_i^y}, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i|_{\widetilde{E}_i^y})$$

which is corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}_i^y, \Gamma_i, \pi_i^y)$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. As before take pairs of open sets $W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j$, $i = 1, \cdots, n'$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n'-1$, such that

$$U_i^1 \subset\subset W_i^2 \subset\subset U_i^2 \cdots \subset\subset W_i^{n'-1} \subset\subset U_i^{n'-1} \subset\subset W_i.$$

We can also require that

$$Cl(U_i^j \cap Y) = Cl(U_i^j) \cap Y, \ i = 1, \cdots, n, \ j = 1, \cdots, n-1. \tag{2.125}$$

(These are easily satisfied by using local coordinate charts and shrinking W_i if necessary.) As before let $\mathcal{N}'$ be the set of all finite subsets $I \in \{1, \cdots, n'\}$ with $W_I = \cap_{i\in I} W_i \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{N} = \{I \in \mathcal{N}' \mid \max I \leq n\}$. For each $I \in \mathcal{N}'$ with $|I| = k$ one uses (2.65) to define V_I. Then for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$ set $W_i^{yj} = W_i^j \cap Y$ and $U_I^{yj} = U_i^j \cap Y$. Then $W_i^{yj} \subset\subset U_i^{yj}$ and for $i = 1, \cdots, n$,

$$U_i^{y1} \subset\subset W_i^{y2} \subset\subset U_i^{y2} \cdots \subset\subset W_i^{y(n-1)} \subset\subset U_i^{y(n-1)} \subset\subset W_i^y.$$

Such choices are reasonable because of $\cap_{i=1}^n W_i^y = \emptyset$ and Remark 2.32. As before, for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$ one uses (2.65) to define

$$V_I^y := \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W_i^{yk}\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} \big(\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U_j^{yk})\big)\Big).$$

Using these we can, as before, get the system of Banach bundles of (X, E, S),

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W}) &:= \big\{(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{W}_I), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\},\\
(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}) &:= \big\{(\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\},\\
(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*) &:= \big\{(\widehat{F}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^*), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

and those corresponding with $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^y, \widehat{W}^y) &:= \big\{(\widehat{E}_I^y, \widehat{W}_I^y), \hat{\pi}_I^y, \hat{\Pi}_I^y, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^{yI}, \hat{\Pi}_J^{yI}, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\\
(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^y, \widehat{V}^y) &:= \big\{(\widehat{F}_I^y, \widehat{V}_I^y), \hat{\pi}_I^y, \hat{\Pi}_I^y, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^{yI}, \hat{\Pi}_J^{yI}, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\\
(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{y*}, \widehat{V}^{y*}) &:= \big\{(\widehat{F}_I^{y*}, \widehat{V}_I^{y*}), \hat{\pi}_I^y, \hat{\Pi}_I^y, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^{yI}, \hat{\Pi}_J^{yI}, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the small neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^{y*}$ of $Z(S|_Y)$ in Y is taken as $\mathcal{W}^* \cap Y$.

Moreover, by (3°) and (2.125) it is easy to see that

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
&W_I \cap Y = \emptyset \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{N}' \setminus \mathcal{N},\\
&V_I \cap Y = V_I^y \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{N}.
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.126}$$

It follows that for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$,

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\big(\widehat{E}^y_I, \widehat{W}^y_I\big) = \big(\widehat{E}_I|_{\widehat{W}^y_I}, \widehat{W}_I \cap (\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(Y)\big)\\ \big(\widehat{F}^y_I,\widehat{V}^y_I\big) = \big(\widehat{F}_I|_{\widehat{V}^y_I}, \widehat{V}_I\cap(\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(Y)\big)\\ \big(\widehat{F}^{y*}_I, \widehat{V}^{y*}_I\big) = \big(\widehat{F}^*_I|_{\widehat{V}^{y*}_I}, \widehat{V}^*_I\cap(\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(Y)\big).\end{array}\right\}\tag{2.127}$$

As before we assume that each bundle $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$ is trivial. Then the trivializations $\mathcal{T}_i:\widetilde{W}_i\times(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde x_i}\to\widetilde{E}_i$ in (2.74) restrict to natural ones

$$\mathcal{T}^y_i:\widetilde{W}^y_i\times(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde x_i}\to\widetilde{E}^y_i,\quad i=1,\cdots,n.$$

Note that the lift section $\widetilde{S}_i:\widetilde{W}_i\to\widetilde{E}_i$ of $S|_{W_i}$ also restricts to such a section

$$\widetilde{S}^y_i=\widetilde{S}_i|_{\widetilde{W}^y_i}:\widetilde{W}^y_i\to\widetilde{E}^y_i$$

of $S|_{W^y_i}$. Let $\widetilde{S}^T_i$ be the trivialization representation of $\widetilde{S}_i$ under $\mathcal{T}_i$. It is easily checked that under $\mathcal{T}^y_i$ the trivialization representation of $\widetilde{S}^y_i$,

$$\widetilde{S}^{yT}_i:\widetilde{W}^y_i\to(\widetilde{E}^y_i)_{\tilde x_i},$$

is exactly the restriction of $\widetilde{S}^T_i$ to $\widetilde{W}^y_i$, i.e., $\widetilde{S}^{yT}_i=\widetilde{S}^T_i|_{\widetilde{W}^y_i}$.

Moreover, let γ_i be the smooth cut-off functions in (2.77), $i=1,\cdots,n'$. Then γ_i, $i=1,\cdots,n$, naturally restricts to such a one $\gamma^y_i:\widetilde{W}^{y1}_i\to[0,1]$ with support in $\widetilde{W}^{y1}_i$, and such that

$$\begin{array}{l}\widetilde{U}^{y0}_i:=\{\tilde x\in\widetilde{W}^y_i\,|\,\gamma_i(\tilde x)>0\}=\widetilde{U}^0_i\cap\widetilde{W}^y_i\subset\subset\widetilde{W}^{y1}_i\quad\text{and}\\ Z(S|_Y)\subset\cup_{i=1}^n U^{y0}_i=\cup_{i=1}^n\pi_i(\widetilde{U}^{y0}_i).\end{array}$$

Carefully checking (2.79) and (2.80) we see that the sections $\tilde\sigma^y_{ij}:=\gamma_i\cdot\tilde s^y_{ij}:\widetilde{W}^y_i\to\widetilde{E}^y_i$ and their trivialization representations

$$\tilde\sigma^{yT}_{ij}:\widetilde{W}^y_i\to(\widetilde{E}_i)_{x_i},\ \tilde x\mapsto\gamma(\tilde x)v_{ij}$$

are exactly the restrictions of $\tilde\sigma_{ij}$ in (2.79) and $\tilde\sigma^T_{ij}$ in (2.80) to $\widetilde{W}^y_i$, $j=1,\cdots,m_i$. As before we use these to get a global section of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}=\{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}'\}$ given by

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I:\widehat{V}^*_I\to\widehat{F}^*_I,\ \hat x_I\mapsto\hat S_I(\hat x_I)+\sum_{i=1}^{n'}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat\sigma_{ij})_I(\hat x_I),$$

and that of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{y*},\widehat{V}^{y*}\big)$, $\Upsilon^{y(\mathbf{t})}=\{\Upsilon^{y(\mathbf{t})}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ given by

$$\Upsilon^{y(\mathbf{t})}_I:\widehat{V}^{y*}_I\to\widehat{F}^{y*}_I,\ \hat x_I\mapsto\hat S^y_I(\hat x_I)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat\sigma^y_{ij})_I(\hat x_I).$$

Here $\mathcal{N}=\{I\in\mathcal{N}'\,|\,\max I\le n\}$. Furthermore we can find a small $\varepsilon>0$ and a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$, $m'=\sum_{i=1}^{n'}m_i$ such that for any

$$\mathbf{t}'=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le n'}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}\quad\text{and}\quad\mathbf{t}:=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\1\le i\le n}}\tag{2.128}$$

(*Note*: when $\mathbf{t}'$ takes over $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$ all corresponding $\mathbf{t}$ form a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$), the above sections are **strongly transversal** to the zero section (by shrinking $\mathcal{W}^*$ and increasing n and n' if necessary). As before we set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) = (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I)^{-1}(0)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}'\} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y) = (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}.$$

Note that $\hat\pi_I$ (resp. $\hat\Pi_I$) restricts to $\hat\pi^y_I$ (resp. $\hat\Pi^y_I$) on $\widehat{W}^y_I$, $\widehat{V}^y_I$ and $\widehat{V}^{y*}_I$ (resp. $\widehat{E}^y_I$, $\widehat{F}^y_I$ and $\widehat{F}^{y*}_I$) and these restrictions are also compatible with $\hat\pi^I_J$ and $\hat\pi^{yI}_J$ for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. One can checks that

$$(\hat\sigma^y_{ij})_I = \begin{cases} (\hat\sigma_{ij})_I|_{\widehat{V}^y_I} & \text{if } I \in \mathcal{N}, \\ 0 & \text{if } I \in \mathcal{N}' \setminus \mathcal{N}. \end{cases}$$

It follows from these, (2.126) and (2.127) that for $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'$ in (2.128), $\Upsilon^{y(\mathbf{t})}_I = \Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I|_{\widehat{V}^{y*}_I}$ and thus

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap (\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(Y) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y), \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{N} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap (\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(Y) = \emptyset, \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{N}' \setminus \mathcal{N}.$$

(2.123) and (2.124) follow immediately. □

Corollary 2.52 *(***Second localization formula***). Let f be an oriented smooth orbifold of finite dimension, $Q \subset P$ be an oriented closed suborbifold of dimension k and a smooth map $f: X \to P$ be such that $Y := f^{-1}(Q) \subset X$ is a Banach suborbifold of codimension* $\dim P - k$. *Then $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is still an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle of index* $\mathrm{Ind}(S|_Y) = r + k - \dim P$ *and for any class $\kappa \in H_*(Q, \mathbb{R})$ of dimension* $\dim P - r$ *it holds that*

$$\langle PD_Q(\kappa), f_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y))\rangle = \langle PD_P(\kappa), f_*(e(E, S))\rangle.$$

Here $PD_Q(a)$ (resp. $PD_P(a)$) is the Poincaré dual of a in $H^*(Q, \mathbb{R})$ (resp. $H^*(P, \mathbb{R})$).

Proof. Let R_S be a retraction from a tubular neighborhood $U(Q)$ of Q in P onto Q (which is identified with the projection the normal bundle of Q in P.) We can take a representative form Q^* of the Poincaré dual $PD_P(Q)$ of Q in P whose support can be required to be contained in $U(Q)$. Then for a representative form κ^*_Q of $PD_Q(\kappa)$ the form $\kappa^* := R^*_S(\kappa^*_Q) \cup Q^*$ is a representative form of $PD_P(\kappa)$ whose support is contained in $U(Q)$.

Let $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}'}$ and $e(E|_Y, S|_Y)^{\mathbf{t}}$ be as constructed in Proposition 2.51. As in the proof of Proposition 1.12, it follows from (2.113) and (2.124) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle PD_Q(\kappa), (f|_Y)_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y))\rangle &= \langle (f|_Y)^*(PD_Q(\kappa)), e(E|_Y, S|_Y)\rangle \\
&= \int_{e(E|_Y, S|_Y)^{\mathbf{t}}} (f|_Y)^*\kappa_Q^* \\
&= \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y)^\circ} (f|_Y \circ \hat{\pi}_I^y)^*\kappa_Q^* \\
&= \int_{(f|_Y\circ\hat{\pi}_I^y)(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y)^\circ)} \kappa_Q^* \\
&= \int_{(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ)\cap Q} \kappa_Q^* \\
&= \int_{R_Q((f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ)\cap Q)} \kappa_Q^* \\
&= \int_{(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ)\cap Q} R_Q^*\kappa_Q^* \\
&= \int_{(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ)} (R_Q^*\kappa_Q^*)\wedge Q^* \\
&= \int_{(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ)} \kappa^* \\
&= \int_{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}'}} f^*\kappa^* \\
&= \langle f^*(PD_P(\kappa)), e(E,S)\rangle \\
&= \langle PD_P(\kappa), f_*(e(E,S))\rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. □

2.8 Properties

In this subsection we shall generalize the other properties for Euler classes of the Banach Fredholm bundles in §1.3 to virtual Euler classes. Without special statements, **all Banach orbifolds are supposed to 1-regular and effective, and all Banach Fredholm orbibundles are oriented, have compact zero loci and also satisfy Assumption 2.45.** (Remark 2.49 is still effective.)

Lemma 2.53 *Let* $p_i : E^{(i)} \to X$, $i = 1, 2$, *be two Banach orbibundles, and* $E := E^{(1)} \oplus E^{(2)} \to X$ *be their direct sum. For any compact subset* $K \subset X$ *let* $(\widetilde{W}_j, \Gamma_j, \pi_j)$ *be orbifold charts centred at* $x_j \in K$ *on* X, $j = 1, \cdots, n$, *and them satisfy (2.8). For* $i = 1, 2$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, n$ *let* $(\widetilde{E}_j^{(i)}, \Gamma_j, \Pi_j^{(i)})$ *be the corresponding Banach orbibundle charts on* $(\widetilde{W}_j, \Gamma_j, \pi_j)$ *of* $E^{(i)}$ *with support* $E_j^{(i)} = (p^{(i)})^{-1}(W_j)$ *such that* $(\widetilde{E}_j^{(1)} \oplus \widetilde{E}_j^{(2)}, \Gamma_j, \Pi_j^{(1)} \oplus \Pi_j^{(2)})$ *are such charts on* $(\widetilde{W}_j, \Gamma_j, \pi_j)$ *of* $E^{(1)} \oplus E^{(2)}$ *with support* $E_j := E_j^{(1)} \oplus E_j^{(2)} = (p^{(1)} \oplus p^{(2)})^{-1}(W_j)$. *Denote by the bundle projections* $\tilde{p}_j^{(i)} : \widetilde{E}_j^{(i)} \to \widetilde{W}_j$ *and*

$\tilde{p}_j := \tilde{p}_j^{(1)} \oplus \tilde{p}_j^{(2)} : \widetilde{E}_j := \widetilde{E}_j^{(1)} \oplus \widetilde{E}_j^{(2)}$, *$i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Note that the action of Γ_j on $\widetilde{E}_j$ is given by $\phi \cdot \tilde{u} = (\phi \cdot \tilde{u}_1, \phi \cdot \tilde{u}_2)$ for $\phi \in \Gamma_j$ and $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \in \widetilde{E}_j$. Assume that*

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(i)}(K), \widehat{W}(K)) = \big\{ \big(\widehat{E}_I^{(i)}, \widehat{W}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I^{(i)}, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_J^{(i)I}, \lambda_J^I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N} \big\}$$

are resolutions of $(E^{(i)}, X)$ as given in §2.2, $i = 1, 2$. Then their direct sum

$$\begin{aligned}&(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(1)}(K) \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(2)}(K), \widehat{W}(K)) := \\ &\big\{ \big(\widehat{E}_I^{(1)} \oplus \widehat{E}_I^{(2)}, \widehat{W}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \lambda_J^I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N} \big\}\end{aligned}$$

is such a resolution of (E, X) near K, where $\hat{\Pi}_I = \hat{\Pi}_I^{(1)} \oplus \hat{\Pi}_I^{(2)}$, and $\hat{\Pi}_J^I = \hat{\Pi}_J^{(1)I} \oplus \hat{\Pi}_J^{(2)I}$. Moreover, for the chosen pairs of open sets $W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$, such that

$$U_i^1 \subset\subset W_i^2 \subset\subset U_i^2 \cdots \subset\subset W_i^{n-1} \subset\subset U_i^{n-1} \subset\subset W_i,$$

the renormalization of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(1)}(K) \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(2)}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$, denoted by $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}(K))$, is equal to the direct sum $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)}(K) \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(2)}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$, where $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$ are the renormalizations of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(i)}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ constructed from the above pairs of open sets, $i = 1, 2$. Furthermore, one has also:

- **(a)** *If $\widehat{S}^{(i)} = \{\widehat{S}_I^{(i)} : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ are the global sections of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(i)}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ generated by the sections $S^{(i)} : X \to E^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$ then $\widehat{S}^{(1)} \oplus \widehat{S}^{(2)} = \{\widehat{S}_I^{(1)} \oplus \widehat{S}_I^{(2)} : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is the section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(1)}(K) \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{(2)}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$ generated by the section $S^{(1)} \oplus S^{(2)} : X \to E^{(1)} \oplus E^{(2)}$.*
- **(b)** *If $\hat{\sigma}_l = \{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ are the sections of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)}, \widehat{V}(K))$ generated by smooth sections $\tilde{\sigma}_l^{(i)} : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l^{(i)}$ with supports in $\widetilde{W}_l^1$ then $\hat{\sigma}_l^{(1)} \oplus \hat{\sigma}_l^{(2)} := \{(\hat{\sigma}_l^{(1)})_I \oplus (\hat{\sigma}_l^{(2)})_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is such a section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)}(K) \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(2)}(K), \widehat{V}(K))$ generated by the section $\tilde{\sigma}_l^{(1)} \oplus \tilde{\sigma}_l^{(2)} : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l^{(1)} \oplus \widetilde{E}_l^{(2)}$.*

Proof. Carefully checking the constructions and arguments in § 2.3 one easily gets the proof of the lemma. □

As a generalization of Proposition 1.13 we have:

Proposition 2.54 *(***Stability***). Let the Banach orbibundles $p_i : E^{(i)} \to X$, $i = 1, 2$ and $E := E^{(1)} \oplus E^{(2)} \to X$ be as in Lemma 2.53. For sections $S^{(i)} : X \to E^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$ and their natural sum $S := S^{(1)} \oplus S^{(2)} : X \to E$, assume that (X, E, S) is an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. Clearly, $Z(S) = Z(S^{(1)}) \cap Z(S^{(2)})$ and $Z(S) = Z(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})})$. Also assume that $S^{(2)}$ is transversal to the zero section at each point $x \in Z(S)$. (So there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in X such that $Z(S^{(2)})^\star := Z(S^{(2)}) \cap \mathcal{U}$ is a smooth orbifold). Then*

$$D(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})}) : (TZ(S^{(2)}))|_{Z(S)} \to E^{(1)}|_{Z(S)}$$

is Fredholm and has index $\mathrm{Ind}(D(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})}) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS)$. Furthermore if both (X, E, S) and $(Z(S^{(2)})^\star, E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$ also satisfy Assumption 2.45 then there exists a virtual Euler cycle representative C (resp.

C_1) of $e(E,S)$ (resp. $e(E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$) such that $C = C_1$ and thus

$$e(E,S) = (i_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})_* e(E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}).$$

Here $(i_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})_*$ is the homomorphism between homology groups induced by the inclusion $i_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star} : Z(S^{(2)})^\star \hookrightarrow X$.

Proof. Since the Euler class of (X,E,S) depends only on the restriction of (X,E,S) to a neighborhood of $Z(S)$ in X we have assumed that $Z(S^{(2)})$ itself is a smooth orbifold. As in the proof of Proposition 2.51 we may use the definition of the suborbifold to choose finitely many points $x_i \in Z(S) \subset Z(S^{(2)})$ and orbifold charts $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ centered at x_i on X and with $W_i \subset \mathcal{U}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that:

(i) For each i there exists a submanifold $\widetilde{W}^z_i \subset \widetilde{W}_i$ that is stable under Γ_i and compatible with the inclusion map, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{W}^z_i, \Gamma^z_i, \pi^z_i) = (\widetilde{W}^z_i, \Gamma_i|_{\widetilde{W}^z_i}, \pi_i|_{\widetilde{W}^z_i})$ is a Banach orbifold chart on $Z(S^{(2)})$. (As explained in the proof of Proposition 2.51, $\Gamma^z_i = \Gamma_i$ and they shall be written as Γ_i below.)

(ii) $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W^z_i = \cup_{i=1}^n \pi_i(\widetilde{W}^z_i)$ $(\subset \cup_{i=1}^n W_i = \cup_{i=1}^n \pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i))$.

For $k = 1, 2$ and each i let $(\widetilde{E}^{(k)}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi^{(k)}_i)$ be the orbifold bundle charts on $E^{(k)}$ corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$, then we get such a chart

$$(\widetilde{E}^{(1)z}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi^{(1)z}_i) = (\widetilde{E}^{(1)}_i|_{W^z_i}, \Gamma_i, \Pi^{(1)}_i|_{\widetilde{E}^{(1)z}_i})$$

on $E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})}$ corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}^z_i, \Gamma_i, \pi^z_i)$. As before we assume that all bundles $\widetilde{E}^{(k)}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$ are trivial, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $k = 1, 2$. For the chosen trivializations

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \times (\widetilde{E}^{(k)}_i)_{x_i} \to \widetilde{E}^{(k)}_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{2.129}$$

they restrict to natural ones

$$\mathcal{T}^{(1)z}_i : \widetilde{W}^z_i \times (\widetilde{E}^{(1)}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i} \to \widetilde{E}^{(1)z}_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{2.130}$$

Now the lift section $\widetilde{S}^{(1)}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}^{(1)}_i$ of $S^{(1)}|_{W_i}$ restricts to such a section $\widetilde{S}^{(1)z}_i = \widetilde{S}^{(1)}_i|_{\widetilde{W}^z_i} : \widetilde{W}^z_i \to \widetilde{E}^{(1)z}_i$ of $S^{(1)}|_{W^z_i}$. It is easily checked that the trivialization representation $\widetilde{S}^{(1)zT}_i : \widetilde{W}^z_i \to (\widetilde{E}^{(1)z}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$ of $\widetilde{S}^{(1)z}_i$ under $\mathcal{T}^{(1)z}_i$ is exactly the restriction of $\widetilde{S}^{(1)T}_i$ to $\widetilde{W}^z_i$, i.e. $\widetilde{S}^{(1)zT}_i = \widetilde{S}^{(1)T}_i|_{\widetilde{W}^z_i}$. As in the proof of Proposition 1.13 we can show that the vertical differential $D\widetilde{S}^{(1)z}_i(x)$ at each zero point x of $\widetilde{S}^{(1)z}_i$ is Fredholm and has the same index as $D\widetilde{S}^{(1)}_i(x)$. This yields the first conclusion.

Take pairs of open sets $W^j_i \subset\subset U^j_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$, such that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W^1_i$ and that

$$U^1_i \subset\subset W^2_i \subset\subset U^2_i \cdots \subset\subset W^{n-1}_i \subset\subset U^{n-1}_i \subset\subset W_i.$$

Let $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(j)}, \widehat{V})$, $j = 1, 2$ and $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}) = (\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)} \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(2)}, \widehat{V})$ be the corresponding bundle systems constructed in Lemma 2.53 (by taking $K = Z(S)$). As the construction of the bundle system $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^y, \widehat{V}^y\big)$ in the proof of Proposition 2.51 we now can get such bundle systems of $(Z(S^{(2)}), E^{(j)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})}, S^{(j)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})})$,

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(j)z}, \widehat{V}^z\big) := \big\{\big(\widehat{F}_I^{(j)z}, \widehat{V}_I^z\big), \hat{\pi}_I^z, \hat{\Pi}_I^{(j)z}, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^{zI}, \hat{\Pi}_J^{(j)zI}, \lambda_J^I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},$$

which are exactly the restriction of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(j)}, \widehat{V})$, $j = 1, 2$. Let us choose a small neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $Z(S)$ in X and set $\mathcal{W}^{*z} := \mathcal{W}^* \cap Z(S^{(2)})$. Denote by $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(j)z*}, \widehat{V}^{z*}\big)$ (resp. $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big)$) the restriction system of bundles of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(j)z}, \widehat{V}^z\big)$ (resp. $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}\big)$) to $\mathcal{W}^{z*}$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}^*$), $j = 1, 2$. Then $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)z*}, \widehat{V}^{z*}\big)$ is exactly the restriction of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)*}, \widehat{V}^*\big)$ to $\mathcal{W}^{z*}$.

Moreover, the smooth cut-off function γ_i in (2.77) naturally restricts to such a one $\gamma_i^z : \widetilde{W}_i^z \to [0, 1]$ and such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{U}_i^{z0} := \{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i^z \,|\, \gamma_i(\tilde{x}) > 0\} = \widetilde{U}_i^0 \cap \widetilde{W}_i^z \subset\subset \widetilde{W}_i^{z1},\\
&Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U_i^{z0} = \cup_{i=1}^n \pi_i(\widetilde{U}_i^{z0}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $S^{(2)}$ is transversal to the zero section. As before, for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ we can choose m_i vectors $v_{il}^{(1)} \in (\widetilde{E}_i^{(1)})_{x_i}$, $l = 1, \cdots, m_i$ and then use γ_i, γ_i^z and the trivializations in (2.129) and (2.130) to construct the sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)} = \gamma_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}^{(1)} : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i^{(1)} \subset \widetilde{E}_i$ and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z} = \gamma_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}^{(1)z} : \widetilde{W}_i^z \to \widetilde{E}_i^{(1)z}$$

such that for sufficiently small $\mathcal{W}^*$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and each $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1 \le j \le m_i\\ 1 \le i \le n}}$ in a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ the global section of the Banach bundle system $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})} \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})} : \widehat{V}_I^* \to \widehat{F}_I^*,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

and that of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)z*}, \widehat{V}^{z*}\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})(1)z} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})(1)z} \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})(1)z} : \widehat{V}_I^{z*} \to \widehat{F}_I^{(1)z*},\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I^{(1)z}(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

are strongly transversal to the zero section. Here $\{(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ denotes the global section of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big)$ generated by $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)}$. Clearly, $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I$ takes values in $\widehat{F}_I^{(1)z*}$. Consider the families of manifolds of the zero loci of these sections,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\} \quad \text{and}\\
&\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}) \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{2.131}$$

In fact, for any $\hat{x}_I \in \widehat{V}_I^*$ one can derive from Lemma 2.53 that

$$\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) = \hat{S}_I^{(1)}(\hat{x}_I) \oplus \hat{S}_I^{(2)}(\hat{x}_I) \in (\widehat{F}_I^*)_{\hat{x}_I} = (\widehat{F}_I^{(1)*})_{\hat{x}_I} \oplus (\widehat{F}_I^{(2)*})_{\hat{x}_I}$$

and $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I(\hat{x}_I) \in (\widehat{F}_I^{(1)*})_{\hat{x}_I} \oplus 0 \subset (\widehat{F}_I^{(1)*})_{\hat{x}_I} \oplus (\widehat{F}_I^{(2)*})_{\hat{x}_I} = (\widehat{F}_I^{(1)*})_{\hat{x}_I}$. So $\hat{x}_I \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_I$, i.e.

$$\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I(\hat{x}_I) = 0$$

implies that $\hat{S}_I^{(2)}(\hat{x}_I) = 0$ and

$$\hat{S}_I^{(1)}(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I(\hat{x}_I) = 0. \tag{2.132}$$

It follows from the first equality that $\hat{x}_I \in \widehat{V}_I^{z*}$. Note that the restriction of $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I$ to $\widehat{V}_I^{z*}$ is equal to $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z})_I$. We derive from (2.132) that

$$\hat{S}_I^{(1)}(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z})_I(\hat{x}_I) = 0.$$

That is, $\hat{x}_I \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})})$. This shows that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$.

On the other hand $\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) = \hat{S}_I^{(1)}(\hat{x}_I)$ and $(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z})_I(\hat{x}_I) = (\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I(\hat{x}_I)$ for any $\hat{x}_I \in \widehat{V}_I^{z*}$. So it is clear that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}$. (2.131) is proved.

One can also easily prove that for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ the projections $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ and $\hat{\pi}_J^{zI}$ have the same domain and image as maps from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$ to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$. It follows that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the corresponding virtual Euler chains (or cycles)

$$\begin{aligned} &e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ \to X\} \quad \text{and} \\ &e(E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})^{\mathbf{t}} \\ &= \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I^z : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})^\circ \to Z(S^{(2)})^\star\} \end{aligned}$$

are same. The desired result is proved. □

As a consequence we can get the following slight generalization of Proposition 2.8 in [R1].

Corollary 2.55 *Let X be a separable Banach orbifold satisfying Assumption 2.45 and (X,E,S) be an oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. Assume:*

(i) $\dim \mathrm{Coker} DS(y) = k$ *on $Z(S)$, $Z(S)$ is a closed smooth orbifold of dimension $r+k$ and thus* CokerDS *forms an obstruction bundle $\mathcal{E}$ over $Z(S)$.*

(ii) *There exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ and a decomposition of the direct sum of Banach orbibundles*

$$E|_{\mathcal{W}} = F \oplus F^c$$

such that $F^c|_{Z(S)}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}$ and that the Banach orbisubbundle F of corank k restricts to $\mathrm{Im}(DS)$ on $Z(S)$, i.e., $F_y = \mathrm{Im}(DS(y))$ for any $y \in Z(S)$.

Then there exist a virtual Euler cycle representation M of $e(E,S)$ and that N of $\mathcal{E}$ such that $M = N$, and in particular $e(E,S) = e(\mathcal{E}) \cap [Z(S)]$.

Indeed, as in the proof of Corollary 1.14 we can use Proposition 2.54 to derive it.

Similar to the arguments in §2.5.2 we can directly use Claim 2.43 and the restriction principle in Proposition 2.50 to prove the following property.

Proposition 2.56 *(***Homotopy***) Let $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$, be two oriented Banach Fredholm bundles of index r and with compact zero locus. Assume that $\partial X = \emptyset$ and $(X \times [0,1], E, S)$ is an oriented homotopy between them. Then there exist virtual Euler chains of $(X \times [0,1], E, S)$, $(X, E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ and $(X, E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ respectively, $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, $e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})^{\mathbf{t}_0}$ and $e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})^{\mathbf{t}_1}$ such that*

$$\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})^{\mathbf{t}_0} \cup (-e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})^{\mathbf{t}_1}).$$

In particular if the virtual Euler classes of $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$, also exist, then $e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)}) = e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$.

Actually, in the theorem above, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ if the m-boundary $\partial^m X \neq \emptyset$ then $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ has the m-boundary (defined in an obvious way),

$$\partial^m e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \partial^{m-1} e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})^{\mathbf{t}_0} \cup \partial^{m-1} e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})^{\mathbf{t}_1} \cup e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_m,$$

where we neglect the orientation and

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_m := \text{“}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}}\text{”} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\bigl\{\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(\partial^m X \times (0,1)) \to X \times [0,1]\bigr\}.$$

Next we study the **functoriality** of the Euler class of the Banach Fredholm orbibundles. Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be two oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundles with compact zero loci. A **morphism** from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S') is an orbibundle embedding $(\psi, \Psi) : E \to E'$ with following properties:

(A) $S \circ \psi = \Psi \circ S'$ and $Z(S') = \psi(Z(S))$;

(B) For any $x \in Z(S)$, the differential $d\psi(x) : T_x X \to T_{\psi(x)} X'$ and the above restriction $\Psi_x : E_x \to E'_{f(x)}$ induce isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} &d\psi(x) : \mathrm{Ker}(DS(x)) \to \mathrm{Ker}(DS'(\psi(x))) \quad \text{and} \\ &[\Psi_x] : \mathrm{Coker}(DS(x)) \to \mathrm{Coker}(DS'(\psi(x))), \end{aligned}$$

and the resulting isomorphism from $\det(DS)$ to $\det(DS')$ is orientation preserving. (These are all understand on levels of lifts.)

Clearly, (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') have the same index. Corresponding with Proposition 1.17 we have:

Proposition 2.57 *Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be two oriented Banach Fredholm orbibundles with compact zero loci, and (ψ, Ψ) be a morphism from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S'). Then there exist a family of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple (X', E', S'),*

$$e(E', S')^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')^\circ \to X'\}\ \forall \mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res},$$

and that of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple (X, E, S),

$$e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ \to X\}\ \forall \mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res},$$

and a family of embeddings $\{\widehat\psi_I \,|\, I\in\mathcal{N}\}$, $\widehat\psi_I : \widehat W_I \to \widehat W'_I$, which are also compatible with the projections $\hat\pi^I_J$ and $\hat\pi'^I_J$, such that for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$ and $J\subset I$,

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}
\widehat\psi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')^\circ \cap (\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(\psi(X)),\\
\widehat\psi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^{sing}) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')^{sing} \cap (\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(\psi(X)),\\
\widehat\psi_J\circ\hat\pi^I_J = \hat\pi'^I_J|_{\widehat\psi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))}\circ\widehat\psi_I,\\
\Big(\hat\pi'^I_J\big((\hat\pi'^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat V'^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')\big)\Big)\cap(\hat\pi'_J)^{-1}(\psi(X))\\
=\widehat\psi_I\Big(\hat\pi^I_J\big((\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat V^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\big)\Big),\\
\Big(\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi'^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S')\Big)\cap(\hat\pi'_J)^{-1}(\psi(X))\\
=\widehat\psi_I\big(\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\big)
\end{array}\right\}\tag{2.133}$$

If $\overline{W}$ and $\overline{W}'$ are the spaces constructed from $\{\widehat W_I \,|\, I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ and $\{\widehat W'_I \,|\, I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ respectively then $\{\widehat\psi_I \,|\, I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ induce a natural map $\bar\psi : \overline{W}\to\overline{W}'$ such that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}
\bar\psi(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S')^\circ\cap(\hat\pi')^{-1}(\psi(X)),\\
\bar\psi\circ\hat\pi = \hat\pi'|_{\bar\psi(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ)}\circ\bar\psi
\end{array}\right\}\tag{2.134}$$

Consequently, if $e(E, S)$ and $e(E', S')$ exist, $\langle\psi^*\alpha, e(E, S)\rangle = \langle\alpha, e(E', S')\rangle$ for any $\alpha\in H^*(X', X'\setminus\psi(X);\mathbb{R})$. (In this case we say $\psi_* e(E, S)$ to be the intersection of $e(E', S')$ with $\psi(X)$.)

Proof. By the definition of the morphism we may assume: **X is a Banach suborbifold of X', E is a suborbibundle of $E'|_X$ and $S = S'|_X$.** Of course, both f and F are inclusion maps. In particular, by (A) we have $Z(S') = Z(S)$. As in the proof of Proposition 2.51 we can choose finitely many points

$$x_i\in Z(S) = Z(S'), i = 1, \cdots, n,$$

and orbifold charts $(\widetilde W'_i, \Gamma'_i, \pi'_i)$ on X' centered at x_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that:

(1°) For each i there exists a submanifold $\widetilde{W}_i \subset \widetilde{W}'_i$ that is stable under Γ'_i and compatible with the inclusion map, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma'_i, \pi_i) = (\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma'_i|_{\widetilde{W}_i}, \pi'_i|_{\widetilde{W}_i})$ is a Banach orbifold chart on X. (see the explanations in the proof of Proposition 2.51 for the reason that $\Gamma'_i = \Gamma'_i|_{\widetilde{W}_i}$.)

(2°) $\{W_i = \pi_i(\widetilde{W}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ is an open cover of $Z(S)$ in X and thus $\{W'_i = \pi'_i(\widetilde{W}'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ is such a cover of $Z(S')$ in X'.

Similarly, for each i let $(\widetilde{E}'_i, \Gamma'_i, \Pi'_i)$ be the orbifold bundle chart on E' corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}'_i, \Gamma'_i, \pi'_i)$, then there exists a suborbibundle $\widetilde{E}_i \subset \widetilde{E}'_i|_{W_i}$ that is stable under Γ'_i and compatible with the inclusion map, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma'_i, \Pi_i) = (\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma'_i|_{\widetilde{E}_i}, \Pi'_i|_{\widetilde{E}_i})$ is a Banach orbibundle chart on E which is corresponding with $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma'_i, \pi_i)$.

As usual take pairs of open sets $W'^j_i \subset\subset U'^j_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n,\ j = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$, such that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W'^1_i$ and that

$$U'^1_i \subset\subset W'^2_i \subset\subset U'^2_i \cdots \subset\subset W'^{n-1}_i \subset\subset U'^{n-1}_i \subset\subset W'_i.$$

Set $W^j_i := W'^j_i \cap X$ and $U^j_i := U'^j_i \cap X$ then they are pairs of open sets in X and $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W^1_i$. Moreover, for $i = 1, \cdots, n,\ j = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$ it also holds that $W^j_i \subset\subset U^j_i \subset\subset W_i$ and

$$U^1_i \subset\subset W^2_i \subset\subset U^2_i \cdots \subset\subset W^{n-1}_i \subset\subset U^{n-1}_i \subset\subset W_i.$$

As before we can use these to construct the corresponding bundle systems $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$, $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$ $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}', \widehat{W}')$, $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}', \widehat{V}')$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big) &:= \big\{\big(\widehat{F}^*_I, \widehat{V}^*_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma'_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda'^I_J \ \big|\ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\\
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'^*, \widehat{V}'^*\big) &:= \big\{\big(\widehat{F}'^*_I, \widehat{V}'^*_I\big), \hat{\pi}'_I, \hat{\Pi}'_I, \Gamma'_I, \hat{\pi}'^I_J, \hat{\Pi}'^I_J, \lambda'^I_J \ \big|\ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the small neighborhoods $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $Z(S)$ in X is taken as $\mathcal{W}'^* \cap X$.

For each $i = 1, \cdots, n$, as before we take Γ'_i-invariant smooth cut-off function $\gamma'_i : \widetilde{W}'_i \to [0, 1]$ with support in $\widetilde{W}'^1_i$, such that

$$Z(S') \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U'^0_i = \cup_{i=1}^n \pi'_i(\widetilde{U}'^0_i)$$

for $\widetilde{U}'^0_i := \{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}'_i \,|\, \gamma'_i(\tilde{x}) > 0\}$. Then for $U^0_i := U'^0_i \cap X$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, it holds that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U^0_i$.

Let $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ (resp. $\widetilde{S}'_i : \widetilde{W}'_i \to \widetilde{E}'_i$) be the lift of $S|_{W_i}$ (resp. $S'|_{W'_i}$). Then by (A) and (B) it also holds that $Z(\widetilde{S}'_i) = Z(\widetilde{S}_i)$, and that for any $\tilde{x} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_i)$, $D\widetilde{S}'_i(\tilde{x})|_{T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i} = D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})$, $\mathrm{Ker}(D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})) = \mathrm{Ker}(D\widetilde{S}'_i(\tilde{x}))$ and the inclusion $(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}} \hookrightarrow (\widetilde{E}'_i)_{\tilde{x}}$ induces an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}}/D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}) \to (\widetilde{E}'_i)_{\tilde{x}}/D(\widetilde{S}'_i)(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}'_i),\\
&\tilde{v} + D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i) \mapsto \tilde{v} + D\widetilde{S}'_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}'_i).
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence we get:

Claim 2.58 *Let* $\tilde{x} \in Z(\widetilde{S}'_i) = Z(\widetilde{S}_i)$ *and* $\tilde{v}_i \in (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}}, i = 1, \cdots, k$, *satisfy*

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i) + \mathrm{span}\{\tilde{v}_1, \cdots, \tilde{v}_k\} = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}}.$$

Then $D\widetilde{S}'_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}'_i) + \mathrm{span}\{\tilde{v}_1, \cdots, \tilde{v}_k\} = (\widetilde{E}'_i)_{\tilde{x}}$.

For the chosen trivializations

$$\mathcal{T}'_i : \widetilde{W}'_i \times (\widetilde{E}'_i)_{\tilde{x}_i} \to \widetilde{E}'_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, n,$$

they restrict to natural ones

$$\mathcal{T}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \times (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i} \to \widetilde{E}_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, n.$$

By increasing n and shrinking W'_i one can take $\tilde{v}_{ij} \in (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}_i}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$ such that for any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i$ and $\tilde{s}_{ij}(\tilde{x}) := \mathcal{T}_i(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v}_{ij})$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$,

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i) + \mathrm{span}\{\tilde{s}_{i1}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \tilde{s}_{im_i}(\tilde{x})\} = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}}. \tag{2.135}$$

Note that for any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i$, $\tilde{s}'_{ij}(\tilde{x}) := \mathcal{T}'_i(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v}_{ij})$ are equal to $\tilde{s}_{ij}(\tilde{x})$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m_i$. By Claim 2.58 we get that for any $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}'_i$,

$$D\widetilde{S}'_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}'_i) + \mathrm{span}\{\tilde{s}'_{i1}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \tilde{s}'_{im_i}(\tilde{x})\} = (\widetilde{E}'_i)_{\tilde{x}}. \tag{2.136}$$

Consider the sections $\sigma'_{ij} := \gamma'_i \cdot \tilde{s}'_{ij}$ of $\widetilde{E}'_i$ with supports in $\widetilde{W}'^1_i$, and those $\sigma_{ij} := \gamma'_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}$ of $\widetilde{E}_i$ with supports in $\widetilde{W}^1_i$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$. Clearly, $\sigma_{i1} = \sigma'_{i1}|_{\widetilde{W}_i}, \cdots, \sigma_{im_i} = \sigma'_{im_i}|_{\widetilde{W}_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Assume that the above small neighborhood $\mathcal{W}'^*$ of $Z(S')$ in X is contained in $\cup_{i=1}^n U'^0_i$ (and thus $\mathcal{W}^* = \mathcal{W}'^* \cap X \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U^0_i$). By (2.135) and (2.136), as before we can shrink $\mathcal{W}'^*$ and find a small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1 \le j \le m_i \\ 1 \le i \le n}}$ in a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $m = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$ the sections sections

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I : \widehat{V}^*_I \to \widehat{F}^*_I,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

$$\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I : \widehat{V}'^*_I \to \widehat{F}'^*_I,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}'_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}'_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

are strongly transversal to the zero section for all $I \in \mathcal{N}$.

One also easily checks that $\widehat{F}^*_I$ is a Banach subbundle of $\widehat{F}'^*_I|_{\widehat{V}^*_I}$,

$$\widehat{V}^*_I = \widehat{V}'^*_I \cap (\hat{\pi}'_I)^{-1}(X), \quad \widehat{F}^*_I = \widehat{F}'^*_I \cap (\hat{\Pi}'_I)^{-1}(E), \quad \Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I = \Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I|_{\widehat{V}^*_I}$$

and these relation are also compatible with $\hat{\pi}^I_J$, $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ and $\hat{\pi}'^I_J$, $\hat{\Pi}'^I_J$. As usual let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) = (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S') = (\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0)$. Then (2.133) and (2.134) easily follows from these. □

Note that the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ may be viewed a 'subset' of the system

$$\widehat{V} = \big\{\widehat{V}_I, \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I,\ \lambda^I_J \ \big|\ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$$

(a resolution of X near $Z(S)$) and the Euler chain $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ may be viewed as a smooth map from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ to X. One can also consider the Euler class of pull-back Banach Fredholm orbibundles by Fredholm maps. It is possible for us to get the following generalization of Proposition 1.18.

Proposition 2.59 *Let X and X' be two separable Banach orbifolds satisfying Assumption 2.45, and (X,E,S) (resp. (X',E',S')) be the Banach Fredholm orbibundle of index r (resp. r'). Let $f : X \to X'$ be a proper Fredholm map of index d. Assume that that $\bar{f} : (X,E,S) \to (X',E',S')$ is a bundle map covering f, i.e. a bundle map $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ satisfying $S' \circ f = \bar{f} \circ S$, and that each local lifting of $\bar{f}$ is a Banach space isomorphism when restricted to each fiber. (That is, (X,E,S) is the pull-back of (X',E',S') via f). Furthermore assume that f is also a submersion. Then one has:*

(i) *$r = r' + d$ and $Z(S') = f^{-1}(Z(S))$ is compact.*

(ii) *There exist a resolution $\widehat{V}$ of X near $Z(S)$ and that $\widehat{V}'$ of X' near $Z(S')$, and a natural map $\hat{f} : \widehat{V} \to \widehat{V}'$ induced by f, and the virtual Euler chain $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ (resp. $e(E',S')^{\mathbf{t}}$), as a smooth map from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \subset \widehat{V}$ (resp. $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S') \subset \widehat{V}'$) to X (resp. X') satisfy*

$$f \circ e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = e(E',S')^{\mathbf{t}} \circ \hat{f}. \tag{2.137}$$

The proof of Proposition 2.59 can be completed by slightly modifying the proof of Proposition 4.15. We omit them.

Remark 2.60 We conjecture that there exists some kind $\mathbb{Q}$-value topological degree $\deg(f)$ of f so that (2.137) gives

$$f_* e(E,S) = \deg(f) e(E',S')$$

in the case $d = 0$ and both $e(E,S)$ and $e(E',S')$ exist.

Finally, corresponding to Proposition 1.15, one may **expect** the following:

Let (X,E,S) and (X',E',S') be two Banach Fredholm orbibundles with compact zero loci $Z(S)$ and $Z(S')$. r and r' are their indexes respectively. Then the natural product $(X \times X', E \times E', S \times S')$ is such a bundle of index $r'' = r + r'$ and with zero locus $Z(S \times S') = Z(S) \times Z(S')$, and there exist virtual Euler chains C of (X,E,S), C' of (X',E',S') such that the product $C'' = C \times C'$ is a Euler chain of $(X \times X', E \times E', S \times S')$. Furthermore, if Assumption 2.45 is also satisfied for (X,E,S) and (X',E',S') (so that $e(E,S)$ and $e(E',S')$ exist), then $e(E \times E', S \times S')$ also exists, and is equal to $e(E,S) \times e(E',S')$.

We cannot prove it here. The problem can be explained briefly as follows: Let $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$ be the orbifold charts on X such that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n W_i$, and $(\widetilde{E}_i, \Gamma_i, \Pi_i)$ be the corresponding orbifold bundle charts on E with $(\widetilde{W}_i, \Gamma_i, \pi_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$; moreover, let $(\widetilde{W}'_i, \Gamma'_i, \pi'_i)$ be the orbifold charts on X' such that $Z(S') \subset \cup_{i=1}^{n} W_i'$, and $(\widetilde{E}_i', \Gamma_i', \Pi_i')$ be the corresponding orbifold bundle charts on E' with $(\widetilde{W}_i', \Gamma_i', \pi_i')$, $i = 1, \cdots, n'$. For $(X \times X', E \times E', S \times S')$ we naturally choose the orbifold charts $(\widetilde{W}_i \times \widetilde{W}_k', \Gamma_i \times \Gamma_k', \pi_i \times \pi_k')$ on $X \times X'$, and the corresponding orbifold bundle charts $(\widetilde{E}_i \times \widetilde{E}_k', \Gamma_i \times \Gamma_k', \Pi_i \times \Pi_k')$ on $E \times E'$ with $(\widetilde{W}_i \times \widetilde{W}_k', \Gamma_i \times \Gamma_k', \pi_i \times \pi_k')$, $i = 1, \cdots, n, k = 1, \cdots, n'$. Clearly, $Z(S \times S') \subset \cup_{i=1}^{n} \cup_{k=1}^{n'} W_i \times W_k'$. When we start from $(\widetilde{W}_i \times \widetilde{W}_k', \Gamma_i \times \Gamma_k', \pi_i \times \pi_k')$ and $(\widetilde{E}_i \times \widetilde{E}_k', \Gamma_i \times \Gamma_k', \Pi_i \times \Pi_k')$ and attempt to use the standard way to construct a system of virtual Banach vector bundles, **the first difficulty we meet** is: not each index $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}'$ can be expressed as form $I \times I'$, $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $I' \in \mathcal{N}'$. Here $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N}'$ are respectively corresponding sets of index with $\{\widetilde{W}_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ and $\{\widetilde{W}_i'\}_{i=1}^{n'}$.

3 The Euler cycle of the partially smooth Banach Fredholm bundle

We begin with the introduction of the notion of partially smooth Banach manifolds and Banach vector bundles and then extend Theorem 1.5 to the partially smooth category. Here one needs to overcome another kind of difficulty. We shall abstract the most essential properties which can guarantee the expected conclusions. That is, Theorem 1.5 can be extended to a class of the partially smooth Banach Fredholm bundles. From now on we abbreviate "**partially smooth**" as "**PS**". Moreover, we consider the boundary as a special case of the corner.

Definition 3.1 A Hausdorff topological space X is called a **PS Banach manifold (with corner)** if there exists a decomposition $X = \cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda}X_\alpha$ indexed by a set Λ with a partial order $\prec$ with 0 as the largest element such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) Any two X_α and X_β with $\alpha \neq \beta$ are disjoint, and each point of X has a neighborhood that may only intersect with finitely many X_α.

(ii) Each X_α, called a **stratum**, is a smooth Banach manifold with corner whose topology assures the inclusion $X_\alpha \hookrightarrow X$ to be continuous.

(iii) The stratum X_0, called the **top stratum** of X, is a nonempty open subset in X. Other strata cannot contain any interior point of X, and are called **lower strata**.

(iv) For each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ the stratum X_α is relatively open in $\cup_{\beta\prec\alpha}X_\beta$ with respect to the induced topology from X. For any $\beta \in \Lambda$ with $\beta \prec \alpha$ and $\beta \neq \alpha$, the stratum X_β cannot contain any relative interior point of X_α in $\cup_{\beta\prec\alpha}X_\beta$.

If only conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied, X is called a **weakly PS Banach manifold**. (In this case Λ may not required to have a partial order.) For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, a **weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r** is a weakly PS manifold whose lower strata have dimension less than $r - k$.

Remark 3.2 (1°) Actually one usually makes arguments near a compact subset. So we may assume that our PS Banach manifold has only finitely many strata in the following arguments. The condition (ii) implies that the Banach manifold topology of each stratum is either the same as the induced topology from X or stronger than the induced topology.
(2°) The condition (iii) implies that

$$X_0^\infty := \bigcap_{K\subset X_0 \text{ compact}} Cl(X_0 \setminus K)$$

is contained in the union of all lower strata of X, where $Cl(X_0 \setminus K)$ is the closure of $X_0 \setminus K$ in X. (The condition (iv) implies a similar remark for X_α.) Let us denote by

$$\partial_t X \quad (\text{resp.} \quad \partial_t X_0\,)$$

the **topological boundary** of X (resp. X_0), and by

$$\partial X \quad (\text{resp.} \quad \partial X_0\,)$$

the **boundary PS Banach manifold of** X (resp. the boundary Banach manifold of X_0). That is, $\partial X = \cup_\alpha \partial X_\alpha = \cup_\alpha \partial^1 X_\alpha$, where $\partial^1 X_\alpha$ is the (codimension one) boundary Banach submanifold of X_α, see Definition A.6 for the precise sense of ∂^1. Then $\partial_t X = \partial_t X_0$ consists of two parts, the union of the lower strata of X, and the union of all corner submanifolds of X_0. Thus $\partial_t X = \partial_t X_0 = X_0^\infty$ if X_0 has no corners (including boundary). *Warning:* a PS Banach manifold without corner might still have nonempty topological boundary.
(3°) A Banach manifold with corner may be viewed as a PS Banach manifold. The lower strata of it consist of the various dimensional corners of X. However, by Definition A.4 one easily sees that a PS Banach manifold is not necessarily a Banach manifold with corner. They are different two notions.

A topological subspace Z of X is called a **PS Banach submanifold** of X if there exists a partial order subset $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda$ with maximal element α_0 such that (i) $Z = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda_0} Z_\alpha$, where $Z_\alpha = Z \cap X_\alpha$ is a Banach submanifold of X_α for each $\alpha \in \Lambda_0$, (ii) $Z = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda_0} Z_\alpha$ is also a PS Banach manifold with respect to the induced stratified smooth structure. Clearly, if $X = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ is a PS Banach manifold, for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ the subset $\cup_{\beta \prec \alpha} X_\beta$ is a PS submanifold of X. A PS Banach submanifold $Z = \cup_{\alpha \Lambda_0} Z_\alpha$ as above is called **completely neat** if for any $\alpha \in \Lambda_0$ and $x \in Z_\alpha$ it holds that $\mathrm{ind}_{Z_\alpha}(x) = \mathrm{ind}_{X_\alpha}(x)$ and $B_k Z_\alpha = Z_\alpha \cap B_k X_\alpha$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ (cf. Appendix A for the definitions of $\mathrm{ind}_{Z_\alpha}(x)$ and $B_k Z_\alpha$.) For $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, a weakly PS Banach manifold X is said to be r**-dimensional** if each stratum of it has finite dimension and r is the maximum of dimensions of all strata of it. (In this case the stratum of dimension r is called its **top stratum**.) In particular, we say a PS manifold to be r**-dimensional** if the top stratum of it has dimension r. A (weakly) PS manifold of dimension r is said to be **oriented** if its top stratum is oriented. A topological subspace Z of a weakly PS manifold X is called a **weakly PS submanifold** if it is a weakly PS manifold with respect to the induced topology structure and stratified smooth structure from X. For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, a **weakly** k**-PS submanifold of dimension** r is a weakly PS submanifold whose lower strata have dimension less than $r - k$. That is, this weakly PS submanifold itself is a weakly k-PS manifold according to the induced structure. It is obvious that

$$\text{weakly } k\text{-PS submanifold} \Longrightarrow \text{weakly PS submanifold.}$$

A compact (weakly) PS manifold X (resp. a compact weakly k-PS manifold X) of dimension r is called **closed** if (i) its top stratum is a manifold without corner (including boundary), and (ii) all strata of dimension lower than r have at most dimensions $r - 2$. Thus a compact weakly 1-PS manifold X of dimension r is closed if its top stratum has no corner (including boundary).

(When the top stratum of a compact (weakly) k-PS submanifold has no corner (including boundary) we also say it to be **closed**.) Clearly, one has

Claim 3.3 Any closed weakly PS Banach manifold X of dimension r carries a fundamental class in $H_r(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, or $H_r(X, \mathbb{Z})$ if X is also oriented.

In particular, a compact (weakly) PS manifold of dimension zero is a finite set. A (weakly) PS Banach manifold X is called **separable** if each stratum X_α is separable.

For $x \in X$, if X_α is the stratum of X containing it, we write $T_xX = T_xX_\alpha$. For $0 < k \le \infty$, a **PS C^k-map** f from the PS Banach manifold X to Y is a continuous map $f : X \to Y$ such that the restriction of f to any stratum X_α, $f_\alpha = f|_\alpha$, is a C^k-smooth map into a certain stratum Y_β of Y. If f is a topological embedding and the restriction of it to any stratum X_α is a smooth embedding into some stratum Y_β of Y, then f is called a **PS embedding**. In particular, if the image of f is also open in Y we say f to be a **PS open embedding**. When f is a homeomorphism and both f and f^{-1} are PS embeddings we call f a **PS-diffeomorphism** from X to Y. In particular the PS-diffeomorphism from X to itself is called a **PS automorphism** of X. Denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ the group of automorphisms of X.

Definition 3.4 Let both X and E be two PS Banach manifolds. A surjective PS map $p : E \to X$ is called a **PS Banach vector bundle** if for the stratum decomposition $X = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} X_\alpha$ one has:

(i) The inverse image $p^{-1}(X_\alpha)$ of each stratum X_α of X is exactly a stratum of E.

(ii) The restriction $p|_{p^{-1}(X_\alpha)} : p^{-1}(X_\alpha) \to X_\alpha$ is a smooth Banach vector bundle.

(iii) E has the stratum decomposition $E = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} p^{-1}(X_\alpha)$.

Naturally, one may define a **weakly PS Banach bundle** over a weakly PS Banach manifold.

Corresponding with smooth bundle maps we may define a notion of a **PS bundle map**. In particular, for a PS bundle map $(f, F) : (E, p, X) \to (E', p', X')$, if both $f : X \to X'$ and $F : E \to E'$ are PS open embeddings and for each $x \in X$ the restriction $F|_{E_x} : E_x \to E'_{f(x)}$ is a Banach space isomorphism, we call (f, F) a **PS bundle open embedding** from (E, p, X) to (E', p', X'). Similarly, we have also the notions of **PS bundle isomorphisms**, **PS bundle automorphisms**, **PS subbundles**, and so on. In particular, for an open subset $U \subset X$, a PS finite rank equi-rank subbundle of $E|_U$ is called a **local PS finite rank equi-rank subbundle of** $E|_U$. A **PS section** of E is a continuous section $S : X \to E$ whose restriction on each stratum X_α of X gives a smooth section $S|_{X_\alpha} : X_\alpha \to E_\alpha = E|_{X_\alpha}$. Such a section is called **transversal to the zero section** if the restriction $S|_{X_\alpha}$ of it to each stratum X_α is transversal to the zero section. (In this case, we can only assure that the zero locus $S^{-1}(0)$ is a weakly PS Banach manifold, rather than a PS Banach manifold. This is a reason that we introduce a weakly PS Banach manifold!) Denote by $\Gamma(E)$ the space of all PS sections of E. It might be empty when X is not a Banach manifold.

Definition 3.5 Let $E \to X$ be a PS bundle. A PS section $S : X \to E$ is called **weakly Fredholm** if the restriction of it to each stratum of X is a strongly Fredholm section in the sense above Lemma 1.1. The **index** of such a section is defined as the maximum of Fredholm indexes of restrictions of it to all strata. For an integer $k \geq 0$, a weakly Fredholm PS section $S : X \to E$ is said to be a **weakly k-Fredholm PS section** if

$$\mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\alpha}) + k < \mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_0})$$

for any $\alpha \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha \neq 0$. Furthermore, this weakly Fredholm PS section is called a **k-Fredholm PS section** if

$$\mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\beta}) + k < \mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\alpha})$$

for any two different $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ with $\beta \prec \alpha$. More generally, for a family of negative integers $\mathbf{k} := \{k_{\beta\alpha} \,|\, \beta \prec \alpha,\ \beta, \alpha \in \Lambda\}$, the above weakly Fredholm PS section S is called a **k-Fredholm PS section** if

$$\mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\beta}) + k_{\beta\alpha} < \mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\alpha})$$

for any two different $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ with $\beta \prec \alpha$.

By the definition, a k-Fredholm PS section is a weakly k-Fredholm PS section, and the latter is a weakly Fredholm PS section. Moreover, it is also clear that the index of the restriction of a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section to the top stratum is at least greater k than the indexes of the restrictions of it to the lower strata. It may be considered as a generalization of the notion of the strongly Fredholm section in Section 1. In the case of Gromov-Witten invariants the corresponding section is 1-Fredholm.

Remark 3.6 In Definition 3.1, one may define a PS Banach manifold by the conditions (i)-(iii) and does not require Λ to be a partial order set. In this case we can define the notion of the k-Fredholm section as the above definition of the weakly k-Fredholm section. According to such definitions all arguments in this section (and next one after some corresponding changes have been made) still hold. However, such a definition of a k-Fredholm section can not give a relation among indexes of the restrictions to different lower strata, which is needed for some possible problems. Perhaps, in this case the following definition of a k-Fredholm section is a good choice. Under the above representatives, it holds that $\mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\beta}) + k < \mathrm{Index}(S|_{X_\alpha})$ if $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ are such that X_α is relatively open in $X_\alpha \cup X_\beta$ and X_β does not contain any relative interior points of $X_\alpha \cup X_\beta$.

Definition 3.7 A **weakly PS Banach Fredholm bundle** (of index r) is a triple (X, E, S) consisting of a weakly PS Banach bundle $p : E \to X$ and a weakly Fredholm PS section $S : X \to E$ (of index r). Clearly, each stratum of it, $(X, E, S)_\alpha = (X_\alpha, E|_{X_\alpha}, S|_{X_\alpha})$ is a Banach Fredholm bundle. If $\mathrm{Index}(S_\alpha) = n$ we call $(X, E, S)_\alpha$ **the stratum of codimension** $r - n$ of (X, E, S). A **(weakly)**[5] **PS Banach** k**-Fredholm bundle** (of index r) is a triple (X, E, S) consisting of a PS Banach bundle $p : E \to X$ and a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section $S : X \to E$ (of index r). With the same way we define their strata of codimension $r - n$. These three kinds of bundles are said to be **oriented** if their strata of codimension zero, still denoted by $(X, E, S)_0$ without occurrence of confusions, are oriented (as Banach Fredholm bundles).

Clearly, the stratum of codimension zero of a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle (X, E, S) is exactly $(X_0, E|_{X_0}, S|_{X_0})$ for any $k \geq 0$. Moreover, every (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle (X, E, S) with $k \geq 1$ has no strata of codimension one.

If the above word "Banach" are all replaced by "Hilbert" one gets the **partially smooth Hilbert manifolds and Hilbert bundles**.

As said at the beginning of this section our purpose is to generalize Theorem 1.5 to the PS Banach Fredholm bundle. However carefully checking the proof of Theorem 1.5 it is easy to see that in the present case one cannot necessarily extend an element $v \in E_x$ into a local PS section of the PS bundle $E \to X$ near x. This motivates us to introduce:

Definition 3.8 A class of PS sections $\mathcal{A}$ of E is said to be **rich near** $x \in X$ if for any $v \in E_x$, $\epsilon > 0$ and given open neighborhood of x, $U \subset X$, there exists a PS section $S_v : X \to E$ of class $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\|S_v(x) - v\| < \epsilon$ and $\mathrm{supp}(S_v) \subset U$.[6] It is called **rich near** a subset $K \subset X$ if it is rich near each point of K.

Clearly, if $v \neq 0$ we may choose $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}\|v\|$ so that $\|S_v(x)\| > \frac{1}{2}\|v\|$. It follows that $S_v(y) \neq 0$ for any y sufficiently close to x. More generally, we have:

Lemma 3.9 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a class of PS sections of E, which is rich near x. Then for linearly independent elements $v_1, \cdots, v_n$ in E_x and $0 < \epsilon << \frac{1}{2}\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |v_i|$ there exist an open neighborhood U of x and PS sections $S_1, \cdots, S_n$ of E of class $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\|S_i(x) - v_i\| < \epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, and that the elements $S_1(y), \cdots, S_n(y)$ are linearly independent in E_y for each $y \in U$.*

Proof. By the definition there exist PS sections $S_1, \cdots, S_n$ of E of class $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\|S_i(x) - v_i\| < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. The remains is to prove that

---

[5] In this paper we often write "(A) B". It means two cases "A" and "A B".

[6] The second condition shall be used in the proofs of Theorem 3.14 and Proposition 3.16 and below (4.4).

$S_1(y), \cdots, S_n(y)$ are linearly independent for each y in a small neighborhood U of x. Otherwise there exist a sequence $\{y_m\} \subset X$ and $\mathbf{t}^{(m)} = (t_1^{(m)}, \cdots, t_n^{(m)}) \in S^{n-1}$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n t_k^{(m)} S_k(y_m) = 0$ and $y_m \to x$ as $m \to \infty$. Since S^{n-1} is compact we may assume that $\mathbf{t}^{(m)} \to \mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_n) \in S^{n-1}$ as $m \to \infty$. So $\sum_{k=1}^n t_k S_k(x) = 0$. This contradiction implies the desired result. $\square$

It should be remarked that we do not assume that our PS Banach manifolds must admit PS cut-off functions. (In fact, in actual examples one needs such a condition to check that a class of PS sections is rich near a compact subset in the sense of Definition 3.8). The assumption of richness will take the place of the assumptions about cutoff functions used in the previous sections. It is easily checked that for a PS Banach bundle having rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ near $x \in X$ and a PS map $\varphi : Y \to X$ from a PS Banach manifold Y to X, if Y admits PS cut-off functions with arbitrarily small support near any point then the pull-back PS Banach bundle $\varphi^* E \to Y$ has also rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ near any point $y \in f^{-1}(x)$.

Let (X, E, S) be any one of the three kinds of bundles in Definition 3.7. It is said to have **rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$** if the (weakly) PS Banach bundle $E \to X$ has such PS sections near the zero locus $Z(S)$ of X. For such a bundle (X, E, S) and each $x \in Z(S)$ we have finitely many elements $v_1, \cdots, v_n$ in E_x such that $\mathrm{Im}(DS(x)) + \mathrm{span}(\{v_1, \cdots, v_n\}) = E_x$. It follows from Lemmas 1.2 and 3.9 that there exist PS sections $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_k$ of E of class $\mathcal{A}$ such that the linear operator

$$T_x X \times \mathbb{R}^k \to E_x,\ (\xi, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto DS(x) + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i \sigma_i(x)$$

is surjective. Furthermore, if X_α is the stratum containing x we can find a small neighborhood U of x in X such that the linear operator

$$L(S, y) : T_y X \times \mathbb{R}^k \to E_y,\ (\xi, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto DS(y) + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i \sigma_i(y)$$

is surjective for any $y \in X_\alpha \cap U \cap Z(S)$. However, if $Z(S)$ cannot be contained a single stratum then it is impossible using the present assumptions to derive that $L(S, y)$ is surjective for $y \in U \cap Z(S)$ no matter how U is small. The reasons are that different strata are only related continuously and thus one cannot compare differentials of different Fredholm sections $S|_{X_\alpha}$. Furthermore, even if $L(S, y)$ is surjective for any $y \in U \cap Z(S)$ we can only deduce that the restriction of the section

$$X \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \Pi_1^* E,\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i \sigma_i(y)$$

to $U \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is transverse to the zero section along $(U \cap Z(S)) \times \{0\} \subset U \times \mathbb{R}^k$, and cannot prove that the restriction of the section to a small neighborhood of $(x,0)$ in $X\times\mathbb{R}^k$ is transverse to the zero section yet. Here Π_1 is the projection from $X\times\mathbb{R}^k$ to X. This means that the local transversality cannot be obtained from the present assumptions simply. One needs to apply more assumptions on the PS Banach Fredholm bundle (X,E,S).

Definition 3.10 Let (X,E,S) be a weakly PS Fredholm bundle of index r (resp. a (weakly) PS k-Fredholm bundle of index r) as in Definition 3.7, and have rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$. S is called **quasi-transversal (resp. (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near** $x\in Z(S)$ if for any PS sections $\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_m$ of E of class $\mathcal{A}$ the equality

$$DS(x)(T_xX)+\mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(x),\cdots,\sigma_m(x)\})=E_x$$

(including the case $DS(x)(T_xX)=E_x$) implies that there exist a small open neighborhood $U(x)$ of x in X and $\eta>0$ such that the section

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi: U(x)\times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m)&\to\Pi_1^*(E|_{U(x)}),\\ (x;t_1,\cdots,t_m)&\mapsto S(x)+\sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(x),\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

is transversal to the zero section, and is also a weakly Fredholm PS section of index $m+r$ (resp. a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $m+r$) in the sense of Definition 3.5. Here $\Pi_1: U(x)\times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m)\to U(x)$ is the natural projection. We say S to be **quasi-transversal (resp. (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$** if it is quasi-transversal (resp. (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near each $x\in Z(S)$. Furthermore, S is called **smoothly quasi-transversal (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near** $x\in Z(S)$ if the zero locus of Φ in (3.1), $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ is a true smooth manifold of dimension $m+r$. Naturally, S is said to be **smoothly quasi-transversal (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$** if it is smoothly quasi-transversal (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$. (In this case an orientation on the top stratum of $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ may naturally induce ones on the lower strata.)

Remark 3.11 (i) Clearly, when S is quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near $x\in Z(S)$, if $DS(x)$ is also onto then the restriction of S to a small neighborhood $U(x)$ of x is transversal to the zero section.
(ii) Note that $U(x)\cap Z(S)\times\{0\}\subset Z(\Phi)$ and for any $y\in U(x)\cap Z(S)$ and $(\xi,\mathbf{u})\in T_yX\times\mathbb{R}^m$,

$$D\Phi(y,0)(\xi,\mathbf{u})=DS(y)(\xi)+\sum_{i=1}^m u_i\sigma_i(y).$$

That the section Φ in (3.1) is transversal to the zero section implies that

$$DS(y)(T_yX)+\mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(y),\cdots,\sigma_m(y)\})=E_y\ \forall y\in U(x)\cap Z(S).$$

(iii) When the section Φ in (3.1) is a weakly Fredholm PS section of index $m+r$ (resp. a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $m+r$), for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m)$, it follows from Lemma 1.3(ii) that the section $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}} : U(x) \to E, y \mapsto \Phi(y, \mathbf{t})$ is also a weakly Fredholm PS section of index r (resp. a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index r). In fact, let Φ^α be the restriction of Φ to the stratum $U(x)_\alpha \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m)$ of $U(x) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m)$. It is given by

$$U(x)_\alpha \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{U(x)_\alpha}),\ (y; t_1, \cdots, t_m) \mapsto S^\alpha(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i^\alpha(y),$$

where S^α and σ_i^α are the restrictions of S and σ_i to $U(x)_\alpha$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$. Assume that $E|_{U(x)_\alpha}$ is trivializable over an open subset $V \subset U(x)$ and that $S^{\alpha t}, \sigma_i^{\alpha t} : V \mapsto E_z$ for some $z \in V$ are trivialization representatives of S^α and σ_i^α over V, $i = 1, \cdots, m$. By the definition of the strongly Fredholm section the map

$$\Phi^{\alpha t} : V \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \to E_z,\ (y; t_1, \cdots, t_m) \mapsto S^{\alpha t}(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i^{\alpha t}(y),$$

is Fredholm. So for any $(y, \mathbf{t}) \in V \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m)$ the tangent map

$$\begin{aligned} &d\Phi^{\alpha t}(y, \mathbf{t}) : T_y V \times \mathbb{R}^m \to E_z, \\ &(\xi; u_1, \cdots, u_m) \mapsto dS^{\alpha t}(y)(\xi) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i d\sigma_i^{\alpha t}(y)(\xi) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \sigma_i^{\alpha t}(y), \end{aligned}$$

is Fredholm. By Lemma 1.3(ii) the linear map

$$d\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\alpha t}(y) : T_y V \to E_z,\ \xi \mapsto dS^{\alpha t}(y)(\xi) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i d\sigma_i^{\alpha t}(y)(\xi),$$

is Fredholm, where $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\alpha t} : V \to E_z, y \mapsto \Phi^{\alpha t}(y, \mathbf{t})$. It follows that $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\alpha t}$ and thus $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^\alpha$, $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}$ are all Fredholm. The conclusions on index are easily derived from Lemma 1.3(ii).
(iv) In applications to Floer homology one needs stronger conclusions because the strata of codimension one must exist. This is the reason that we introduce the smooth quasi-transversality.

Unlike in Section 1 the corresponding section with one in (3.1) is Fredholm and thus is locally proper, a weakly Fredholm section might not be locally proper. We need to introduce the following notion.

Definition 3.12 Let (X, E, S) be any one of the three kinds of bundles in Definition 3.7, and have rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$. S is called **locally proper relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near** $Z(S)$ if for any $x \in Z(S)$ and PS sections $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_m$ of class $\mathcal{A}$ there exists a neighborhood $U(x)$ and $\eta > 0$ such that the closure of the set

$$\big\{(x, \mathbf{t}) \in U(x) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \,|\, (S + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i)(x) = 0\big\}$$

is compact in $X \times \mathbb{R}^m$, where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Definition 3.13 Let (X, E, S) be a weakly PS Fredholm bundle of index r (resp. a (weakly) PS k-Fredholm bundle of index r) as in Definition 3.7, and have rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$. It is called **good** (resp. (**weakly**) k-**good**) **relative to class** $\mathcal{A}$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) S is quasi (resp. (weakly) k-quasi) transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$;

(b) S is locally proper relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near $Z(S)$.

If S is smoothly quasi-transversal (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$, the above bundle (X, E, S) is called **smoothly good** (resp. **smoothly** (**weakly**) k-**good**) **relative to class** $\mathcal{A}$.

We now are in a position to give and prove the analogue of Theorem 1.5.

Theorem 3.14 *Let X be a separable PS Banach manifold X with corner, and (X, E, S) be a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index r. Then one has:*

(i) *$Z(S)$ is a weakly k-PS submanifold of X of dimension r and with corners provided that S is transversal to the zero section. Moreover, an orientation of (X, E, S) determines one of $Z(S)$. (If (X, E, S) is only a weakly PS Banach Fredholm bundle of index r then $Z(S)$ is a weakly PS submanifold of dimension r.)*

(ii) *In general, if (X, E, S) has* rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ *and* compact zero locus $Z(S)$, *and is also* (weakly) k-good *then one can find an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in X satisfying:*

(ii.1) *There exists a sufficiently small perturbation PS section S' of E, which is a sum of finite PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$, such that the restriction*

$$(S + S')|_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{W} \to E|_{\mathcal{W}}$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section which is transversal to the zero section and has also a compact zero locus $Z((S + S')|_{\mathcal{W}})$. In particular, if S is transversal to the zero section one may take $S' = 0$.

(ii.2) *S' can be chosen so small that $Z((S + S')|_{\mathcal{W}})$ is contained in a given small neighborhood of $Z(S)$. Specially, one can require all k-boundaries $\partial^k(Z((S+S')|_{\mathcal{W}}))$ to be equal to $Z((S+S')|_{\mathcal{W}})\cap\partial^k X$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$.*

(ii.3) *If (X, E, S) is oriented then $Z((S+S')|_{\mathcal{W}})$ is an oriented weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r.*

(ii.4) *Any two such sufficiently small perturbations S' and S'' yield cobordant r-dimensional weakly k-PS manifolds $Z((S+S')|_{\mathcal{W}})$ and $Z((S + S'')|_{\mathcal{W}})$.*

Moreover, if (X, E, S) is smoothly good (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-good) relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ then all words "weakly k-PS manifold(s)" in (ii.1)-(ii.4) above will be replaced by "manifold(s)".

Similar to the convention below Theorem 1.5, in this and next sections we make the following **convention**: when using Sard theorem or Sard-Smale theorem to get an empty set or a PS manifold of dimension lower than expected one *we shall not mention that case* !

Proof of Theorem 3.14. Noting the convention just, by the definition of the weakly PS Banach manifold in Definition 3.1, the definitions above Claim 3.3 and Definition 3.7 we may apply Theorem 1.5 to the restriction of S to each stratum of X to arrive at the desired (i).

To prove (ii), note that S is stratawise Fredholm. For each $x \in Z(S)$ there exist $v_1, \cdots, v_p \in E_x$ such that $DS(x)(T_xX) + \text{Span}(\{v_1, \cdots, v_p\}) = E_x$. Since (X, E, S) has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ it follows from Lemma 1.2 and Lemma 3.9 that there exist PS sections $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_p$ of class $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$DS(x)(T_xX) + \text{Span}(\{\sigma_1(x), \cdots, \sigma_p(x)\}) = E_x.$$

Since S is (weakly) k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near any $x \in Z(S)$, by Remark 3.11(ii) and the compactness of $Z(S)$ one can find finitely many PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$, say $S_1, \cdots, S_m$ [7], such that

$$DS(z)(T_zX) + \text{span}(\{S_1(z), \cdots, S_m(z)\}) = E_z \tag{3.2}$$

for any $z \in Z(S)$. Using the facts that S is (weakly) k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ and also locally proper relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ again, it follows from the compactness of $Z(S)$ that there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$(\mathbf{3.2})_1$ The PS section

$$\Phi : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}}),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S_i(y)$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $m+r$ which is transversal to the zero section. Here Π_1 is the projection from $\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ to $\mathcal{W}$. So $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ is a weakly k-PS submanifold of dimension $m + r($ if $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset)$.

$(\mathbf{3.2})_2$ The closure of $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ in $X \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is compact. It follows that for any small neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ in X there exists an $\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$,

$$Cl(\mathcal{W}) \cap \big(S + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S_i\big)^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{V}. \tag{3.3}$$

Let P_2 be the restriction of the natural projection $\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ to $\Phi^{-1}(0)$. For each stratum $\mathcal{W}_\alpha$ with $\Phi^{-1}(0) \cap (\mathcal{W}_\alpha \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)) \neq \emptyset$, as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 we deduce that the restriction of P_2 to $\Phi^{-1}(0) \cap$

---

[7] These sections can be required to have small supports by Definition 3.8.

$(\mathcal{W}_\alpha\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ is Fredholm and has the same index as $S|_{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a regular value of this restriction if and only if the section $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}:\mathcal{W}_\alpha\to E|_{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}$ is transversal to the zero section. (cf. Proposition A.14). Here

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}:\mathcal{W}\to E|_{\mathcal{W}},\ y\mapsto\Phi(y,\mathbf{t}).\tag{3.4}$$

Applying the Sard-Smale theorem to the restriction of P_2 to each stratum of $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ we get a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$ the section $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}$ in (3.4) is transversal to the zero section, and is also a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index r by Remark 3.11(iii). Take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ such that $Cl(\mathcal{V})\subset\mathcal{W}$. By $(3.2)_2$ we may find an $\epsilon\in(0,\varepsilon)$ such that (3.3) holds for each $\mathbf{t}\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. It follows that $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)\subset\mathcal{V}$ for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. So each $\mathbf{t}\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}:=B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\cap B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$ gives a desired perturbation section $S'=\sum_{i=1}^m t_iS_i$ for which $Z((S+S')|_{\mathcal{W}})=\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ is a compact weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r. Then the conclusions in (ii.1) and (ii.2) may follow directly.

The proof of (ii.3) is almost repeat of that of Theorem1.5(B.2). Indeed, the map

$$\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\times[0,1]\to\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (x,\mathbf{t},t)\mapsto(x,t\mathbf{t})$$

is stratawise Fredholm and the restriction to each stratum has index 1. So the composition of it with Φ gives a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section

$$\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\times[0,1]\to\Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}}),\ (y,\mathbf{t},t)\mapsto S(y)+t\sum_{i=1}^m t_iS_i(y),$$

where Π_1 is also the projection to the first factor. As in Remark 3.11(iii) we get a family of homotopic (weakly) k-Fredholm PS sections

$$\Psi^t:\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\to\Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}}),\ (y,\mathbf{t},t)\mapsto S(y)+t\sum_{i=1}^m t_iS_i(y)$$

for any $t\in[0,1]$. As in the proof of (ii.3) of Theorem1.5(B.2), we can derive from a given continuous nowhere zero section of the restriction of $\det(DS)$ to $Z(S)\cap X_0$ that the weakly k-PS manifold of dimension $m+r$, $\Phi^{-1}(0)=\{(y,\mathbf{t})\in\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\,|\,\Phi(y,\mathbf{t})=0\}$ carries an orientation on its stratum of dimension $r+m$. This orientation naturally induces one on the top stratum of each weakly k-PS submanifold $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ of X.

Obviously, if (X,E,S) is smoothly good (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-good) relative to class $\mathcal{A}$, $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ is a manifold of dimension r because $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)=P_2^{-1}(\mathbf{t})$ and that $\mathbf{t}$ is a common regular value of the restriction of P_2 to each stratum $\Phi^{-1}(0)\cap(\mathcal{W}_\alpha\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ implies that $\mathbf{t}$ is a regular value of P_2 as a smooth map from the smooth manifolds $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ to $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Note also that each stratum $\Phi^{-1}(0)\cap(\mathcal{W}_\alpha\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ is a submanifold of $\Phi^{-1}(0)$.

Finally we prove (ii.4) in two steps. The first step is completely similar to §1. The method in the second step can also be applied to §1. For completeness we will give the detailed proof.

Step 1. For $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_m) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$ and $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \cdots, r_m) \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$ let $\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r})$ denote the space of all C^l-smooth paths $\gamma : [0, 1] \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}$ and $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{r}$. Consider the section

$$\begin{aligned} &\Psi : \mathcal{W} \times [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r}) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}}), \\ &\qquad (x, \tau, \gamma) \mapsto \Phi(x, \gamma(\tau)) = S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i(\tau) S_i(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi_1 : \mathcal{W} \times [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r}) \to X$ is the natural projection and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_m) \in \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r})$. (Note that $\Psi^{-1}(0) \cap (\mathcal{W}_0 \times [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r})) \neq \emptyset$ for $\mathcal{W}_0 := \mathcal{W} \cap X_0$ if $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$.) For any zero (x, τ, γ) of Ψ one has the (vertical) differential

$$\begin{aligned} &D\Psi(x, \tau, \gamma) : T_x X \times \mathbb{R} \times T_\gamma \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r}) \to E_x, \\ &\qquad (\xi, e, \alpha) \to D\Phi(x, \gamma(\tau))(\xi, \alpha(\tau) + e\dot{\gamma}(\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

For $\tau = 0$ and $\tau = 1$ it is surjective as a function of ξ alone since the sections $\Psi(\cdot, 0, \gamma) = \Phi(\cdot, \mathbf{t})$ and $\Psi(\cdot, \tau, \gamma) = \Phi(\cdot, \mathbf{r})$ are transversal to the zero section. For $\tau \in [0, 1] \setminus \{0, 1\}$ we can choose $\alpha(\tau)$ arbitrarily and thus derive that this operator is also surjective as a function of ξ and α. Hence Ψ is transversal to the zero section. Let P be the projection from $\Psi^{-1}(0)$ to the third factor. Applying the arguments in Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 1.5 to each stratum $\Psi^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{W}_\alpha$, we get that $\dim \mathrm{Ker}(DP(x, \tau, \gamma)) = \mathrm{Ind}(S|_{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}) + 1$ at any $(x, \tau, \gamma) \in \Psi^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{W}_\alpha$. Hence the restriction of P to $\Psi^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{W}_\alpha$ is a Fredholm operator of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S|_{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}) + 1$. Moreover, $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)})$ is a regular value of the restriction of P to $\Psi^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{W}_\alpha$ if and only if the restriction of the section

$$\Psi_\gamma : \mathcal{W} \times [0, 1] \to \Pi_1^* E, (x, \tau) \mapsto S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i(\tau) \sigma_i(x),$$

to $\mathcal{W}_\alpha \times [0, 1]$ is transversal to the zero section, which implies that this restriction is a (weakly) k-Fredholm section of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S|_{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}) + 1$. Since $\mathcal{W}$ has only finitely many strata we may use the Sard-Smale theorem to get a residual subset $\mathcal{P}^l_{reg}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r}) \subset \mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r})$ such that each $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}^l_{reg}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{r})$ gives a compact weakly k-PS manifold $\Psi_\gamma^{-1}(0)$ which forms a weakly k-PS manifold cobordsim between $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1}(0)$.

Step 2. Assume that $S'_1, \cdots, S'_{m'}$ are another group of PS sections satisfying

$$DS(z)(T_z X) + \mathrm{span}(\{S'_1(z), \cdots, S'_{m'}(z)\}) = E_z \tag{3.5}$$

for any $z \in Z(S)$. Then we have an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}'$ of $Z(S)$ and $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that:

$\mathbf{(3.5)}_1$ The PS section

$$\Phi' : \mathcal{W}' \times B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'}) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}'}),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m'} t'_i S'_i(y)$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $m'+r$ that is transversal to the zero section. Here Π_1 is the projection from $\mathcal{W}' \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ to $\mathcal{W}$. So $(\Phi')^{-1}(0)$ is a weakly k-PS submanifold of dimension $m'+r$ (if $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$).

$(\mathbf{3.5})_2$ The closure of the zero locus $(\Phi')^{-1}(0)$ in $X \times \mathbb{R}^{m'}$ is compact.

Let $B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{reg} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ be the corresponding residual subset such that for each $\mathbf{t}' = (t'_1, \cdots, t'_{m'}) \in B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{reg}$ the section

$$\Phi'_{\mathbf{t}'} : \mathcal{W}' \to E|_{\mathcal{W}'},\ y \to \Phi'(\cdot, \mathbf{t}')$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index r that is transversal to the zero section.

By (3.2) and (3.5), for any $z \in Z(S)$ one has

$$DS(z)(T_zX) + \mathrm{span}(\{S_1(z), \cdots, S_m(z), S'_1(z), \cdots, S'_{m'}(z)\}) = E_z.$$

As before we can take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^* \subset \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{W}'$ of $Z(S)$ and $0 < \varepsilon^* < \min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}$ such that:

$(\mathbf{3.5})_3$ The PS section

$$\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{W}^* \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^{m'}) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}}),$$
$$(y, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S_i(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m'} t'_i S'_i(y)$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $m+m'+r$ that is transversal to the zero section. Here Π_1 is the projection from $\mathcal{W}^* \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ to $\mathcal{W}^*$. So $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(0)$ is a weakly k-PS submanifold of dimension $m + m' + r($ if $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset)$.

$(\mathbf{3.5})_4$ The closure of the zero locus $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(0)$ in $X \times R^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m'}$ is compact. (One has also $\mathcal{G}^{-1}(0) \cap (X_0 \times R^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m'}) \neq \emptyset$ if $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$.)

Let $(B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^{m'}))_{reg} \subset B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ be the corresponding residual subset such that for each $(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \in (B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^{m'}))_{reg}$ the section

$$\mathcal{G}_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')} : \mathcal{W}^* \to E|_{\mathcal{W}^*},\ y \to \mathcal{G}(\cdot, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index r that is transversal to the zero section.

Take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $Z(S)$ such that $Cl(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{W}^*$. By $(3.5)_4$ we have $\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$ such that the set

$$\cup_{|\mathbf{t}| \leq \epsilon} \cup_{|\mathbf{t}'| \leq \epsilon} Cl(\mathcal{W}^*) \cap (\mathcal{G}_{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')})^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{V}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (t'_1, \cdots, t'_{m'}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m'}$.

By Lemma 1.7 we can take a small

$$(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}') \in (B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_{\varepsilon^*}(\mathbb{R}^{m'}))_{reg} \cap B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$$

such that $\hat{\mathbf{t}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{t}}' \in B_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{reg}$. Let $\mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')$ denote the space of all C^l-smooth paths $\zeta : [0,1] \to B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \times B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$ with $\zeta(0) = (\hat{\mathbf{t}}, 0)$ and $\zeta(1) = (0, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')$. Consider the section

$$\Theta : \mathcal{W}^* \times [0,1] \times \mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}') \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}^*}),$$
$$(x, \tau, \zeta) \mapsto S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \zeta_i(\tau) S_i(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{m'} \zeta'_j(\tau) S'_j(x),$$

where $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_m; \zeta'_1, \cdots, \zeta'_{m'})$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')$ and $\Pi_1 : \mathcal{W}^* \times [0,1] \times \mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}') \to \mathcal{W}^*$ is the projection. Clearly, $\Theta(\cdot, 0, \zeta) = \Phi(\cdot, \hat{\mathbf{t}})$ and $\Theta(\cdot, 1, \zeta) = \Phi'(\cdot, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')$. Since both sections $\Phi(\cdot, \hat{\mathbf{t}})$ and $\Phi'(\cdot, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')$ are transversal to the zero section it follows from $(3.5)_3$ that at any zero (x, τ, ζ) of Θ the (vertical) differential

$$D\Theta(x, \tau, \zeta) : T_x X \times \mathbb{R} \times T_\zeta \mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}') \to E_x$$

is surjective. Hence Θ is transversal to the zero section. (Clearly, $\Theta^{-1}(0) \cap (\mathcal{W}_0^* \times [0,1] \times \mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')) \neq \emptyset$ if $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{W}_0^* := \mathcal{W}^* \cap X_0$). As in Step 1 we have a residual subset $\mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')_{reg} \subset \mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')$ such that any path $\zeta \in \mathcal{B}^l(\hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}')_{res}$ yields a compact weakly k-PS manifold $(\Theta_\zeta(\cdot, \cdot))^{-1}(0)$ which forms a weakly k-PS cobordism between $(\Theta_\zeta(\cdot, 0))^{-1}(0) = (\Phi_{\hat{\mathbf{t}}})^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Theta_\zeta(\cdot, 1))^{-1}(0) = (\Phi'_{\hat{\mathbf{t}}'})^{-1}(0)$ because (3.6) implies that $\Theta_\zeta^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{V} \times [0,1]$. Here $\Theta_\zeta : \mathcal{W}^* \times [0,1] \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}^*})$ is given by $\Theta_\zeta(x, \tau) = \Theta(x, \tau, \zeta)$.

Combing Step 1 and Step 2 we complete the proof of (ii.4).

Finally, if (X, E, S) is smoothly good (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-good) relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ it is easily checked that the argument techniques above Step 1 may also apply to Step 1 and Step 2. □

In general $Z(S + S')$ is called a **Euler chain** of (X, E, S). Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.14, if S is a (weakly) 1-Fredholm PS section and the top stratum X_0 of X has no boundary (including corner) as a Banach manifold then it follows from Theorem 3.14 (ii) that $Z(S + S')$ is a compact (weakly) 1-PS manifold of dimension r and without strata of codimension one, and, in particular, is a closed weakly PS manifold of dimension r. Thus it determines a well-defined homology class $[Z(S + S')]$ in $H_d(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, or a class $[Z(S + S')]$ in $H_d(X, \mathbb{Z})$ if (X, E, S) is oriented, which is independent of choices of generic S'. In this case this class is called the **Euler class** of the triple (X, E, S), and denoted by $e(E, S)$. Correspondingly, $Z(S + S')$ is called a **Euler cycle** of (X, E, S). Later we always consider the oriented case without special statements.

Before discussing furthermore properties we give a relation between finitely dimensional closed weakly PS manifolds and pseudo-cycles. Recall on the page 90 of [McSa1] that a m-dimensional **pseudo-cycle** in a (smooth) manifold V is a smooth map $g : M \to V$ defined on an oriented m-dimensional manifold M(possibly noncompact) such that the boundary

$$g(M^\infty) = \bigcap_{K \subset M\, compact} \overline{g(M \setminus K)}$$

of $g(M)$ has dimension at most $m-2$ in the sense that there exists a smooth manifold W of dimension at most $m-2$ and a smooth map $h: W \to V$ such that $g(M^\infty) \subset h(W)$. When $g(M)$ has compact closure in V, g was called a **strong pseudo-cycle** in [Lu1]. Clearly, these two notions are equivalent in a compact manifold. Note that the identity map $V \to V$ is not a strong pseudo-cycle in the noncompact manifold V according to the definition. It was proved in [McSa] and [Sch]: (i) every strong pseudo-cycle in V represents an integral singular homology class of V, (ii) each integral singular homology class $\alpha \in H_*(V, \mathbb{Z})$ may be represented by **smooth cycles** (a kind of special strong pseudo-cycles) and all smooth cycles representing α are cobordant. Actually Thom showed in [Th] that a suitable integer multiple of any integral singular homology class $\alpha \in H_*(V, \mathbb{Z})$ may be represented by a compact oriented submanifold of X without boundary. Two pseudo-cycles $e: P \to V$ and $g: Q \to V$ are called **transverse** if either $e(P) \cap g(Q) = \emptyset$ or $e(P^\infty) \cap \overline{g(Q)} = \emptyset$, $\overline{e(P)} \cap g(Q^\infty) = \emptyset$ and $T_xV = \mathrm{Im}(de(p)) + \mathrm{Im}(dg(q))$ whenever $e(p) = g(q) = x$. However, for two transverse pseudo-cycles e and g as above, if $\Delta(e, g) := \{(p, q) \in P \times Q | e(p) = g(q)\} \neq \emptyset$ then it is a compact manifold of dimension $\mathrm{dim}P + \mathrm{dim}Q - \mathrm{dim}V$ provided that only one of e and g is strong. Specially, $\Delta(e, g)$ is a finite set if P and Q are of complementary dimension. By Remark 3.2(2°) and the definition of the closed weakly PS Banach manifold below Remark 3.2 we immediately get:

Proposition 3.15 *Let N be a closed oriented weakly PS manifold of dimension n. Then for any smooth manifold Y, the restriction of any PS map $f: N \to Y$ to the top stratum of N is a strong pseudo-cycle of dimension n in Y, and therefore determines an integral singular homology class in $H_n(Y, \mathbb{Z})$, denoted by $f_*([N])$.*

It follows that a closed oriented (weakly) PS manifold of finite dimension behaves as a closed oriented manifold from the point of view of topology.

As in Remark 1.9 we can start from a compact subset $\Lambda \subset Z(S)$ to construct a family of relatively compact (in X) weakly k-PS manifolds of dimension r in any given open neighborhood $U(\Lambda)$,

$$\{(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0) \,|\, \mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\} \tag{3.7}$$

with the following properties:

(i) Each intersection $\Lambda \cap (\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ is compact. (Such $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ is also called a **local Euler chain** of (X, E, S) near Λ later.)

(ii) Any two $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}$ give a weakly k-PS manifold cobordism between $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}'})^{-1}(0)$ in the sense that there exist generic paths $\gamma: [0,1] \to B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)$ with $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{t}$ and $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{t}'$ such that

$$(\Phi^\Lambda)^{-1}(\gamma) := \cup_{t \in [0,1]} \{t\} \times (\Phi^\Lambda_{\gamma(t)})^{-1}(0)$$

is a weakly k-PS manifold with boundary $\{0\} \times (\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0) \cup (-\{1\} \times (\Phi^\Lambda_{\mathbf{t}'})^{-1}(0))$ which is relative compact in $[0,1] \times Cl(U(\Lambda))$.

Now let (X, E, S) be an oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index r and with $k \geq 1$. Furthermore, we also make the following assumptions:

- The zero locus $Z(S)$ is compact.
- It has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ and is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}$;
- The top stratum X_0 of X has no boundary (including corners) as a Banach manifold (near $Z(S)$).

Then by Theorem 3.14(ii), we get the Euler class $e(E, S) = [\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)] \in H_r(X, \mathbb{Z})$, given by a family of cobordant Euler cycles of (X, E, S),

$$\{\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \,|\, \mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}\},$$

where each $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ is actually an oriented closed weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r. If $f : X \to P$ is a PS map from X to a manifold P of finite dimension, by Proposition 3.15 we get a class

$$f_* e(E, S) = f_*([\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)]) \in H_r(P, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Let $\alpha \in H^r(P, \mathbb{R})$ and α^* be a differential form representative of it. One easily checks that for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{reg}$,

$$\langle f^*\alpha, e(E, S)\rangle = \langle \alpha, f_* e(E, S)\rangle = \int_{\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)} f^*\alpha^*, \tag{3.8}$$

where the integration in the right side is understood as follows: Multiply the form $f^*\alpha^*$ by a PS function to $[0, 1]$ which is 1 outside a small neighborhood of $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \setminus (\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0))_0$ and 0 inside a smaller neighborhood and then pass to a limit as these neighborhoods get smaller. Here $(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0))_0 = \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \cap X_0$. Then almost completely repeating the proof of Proposition 1.11 we get:

Proposition 3.16 *(***First localization formula***). If α has a representative form α^* such that $f^*\alpha^*$ has support* $\mathrm{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)$ *contained in a compact subset $\Lambda \subset Z(S)$ then for the family $\{(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\Lambda})^{-1}(0) \,|\, \mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}\}$ in (3.7) there exists a residual subset $B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)^\star_{res} \subset B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)_{res}$ such that*

$$\langle e(E, S), f^*\alpha\rangle = \int_{(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\Lambda})^{-1}(0)} f^*\alpha^*$$

for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^l)^\star_{res}$.

The arguments above Proposition 1.12 can also move to here almost directly. Let (X, E, S) be as in Proposition 3.16. Recall that $X = \cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} X_\alpha$. Denote by r_α the index of the restriction S to X_α. We are interested in the following two classes of PS submanifolds of X:

- $X^\alpha := \cup_{\beta\prec\alpha} X_\beta$, where $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\alpha \neq 0$.
- A PS submanifold $Y = \cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda_0} Y_\alpha \subset X$ indexed by a partial order subset $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda$ with the maximal element α_0 is said to be of **finite codimension** n if the top stratum Y_{α_0} of Y is a Banach submanifold of codimension n in X_{α_0}

and other strata of Y have at least finite codimension n in the corresponding strata of X.

By definition 3.5 it is easily proved that the (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section $S : X \to E$ restricts to a (weakly) k-Fredholm section $S|_{X^\alpha} : X^\alpha \to E|_{X^\alpha}$. So $(X^\alpha, E|_{X^\alpha}, S|_{X^\alpha})$ is also a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index r_α.

By Proposition C.1, the (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section $S : X \to E$ restricts to a Fredholm section $S|_{Y_{\alpha_0}}$ of index $r_{\alpha_0} - n$. Moreover, for other strata Y_α, since $\alpha \prec \alpha_0$ it follows from Definition 3.5 that

$$\mathrm{Index}(S|_{Y_\alpha}) + k \le r_\alpha - n + k < r_{\alpha_0} - n = \mathrm{Index}(S|_{Y_{\alpha_0}}).$$

These show that $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is only a **weakly** PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index $r_{\alpha_0} - n$. Clearly, if Y is closed in X then $Z(S|_Y)$ is also closed and thus compact in Y because of the compactness of $Z(S)$.

In the following we always assume that the PS submanifold Y belong to the above two classes without special statements, and also assume:

- Y is closed in X.

Then $S|_Y$ is locally proper relative to class $\mathcal{A}|_Y$ near $Z(S|_Y)$. Here $\mathcal{A}|_Y$ is the class of PS sections of $E|_Y$ obtained by restricting the PS sections of E of class A to Y. One also easily prove that the bundle $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ has also rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}|_Y$. We conclude:

- $S|_Y$ is weakly k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}|_Y$.

In fact, for any $x \in Z(S|_Y)$, if PS sections $\sigma_1|_Y, \cdots, \sigma_m|_Y$ of $E|_Y$ of class $\mathcal{A}|_Y$ satisfies

$$D(S|_Y)(x)(T_xY) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(x), \cdots, \sigma_m(x)\}) = E_x$$

then the relation $T_xY \subset T_xX$ implies

$$D(S)(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(x), \cdots, \sigma_m(x)\}) = E_x.$$

Since S is (weakly) k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ there exist a small open neighborhood $U(x)$ of x in X and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$U(x) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{U(x)}),\ (x; t_1, \cdots, t_m) \mapsto S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(x),$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $r+m$ that is transversal to the zero section, where $\Pi_1 : U(x) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \to U(x)$ is the natural projection. So the restriction section

$$\begin{aligned} &U(x) \cap Y \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{U(x)\cap Y}),\\ &(x; t_1, \cdots, t_m) \mapsto S|_Y(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i|_Y(x) \end{aligned}$$

is transversal to the zero section as well. Note that this section is (weakly) k-Fredholm (resp. weakly k-Fredholm) if Y is of form X^α (resp. a PS submanifold of finite codimension as the above second class). In summary, under the above assumptions we have proved:

$(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle which is (weakly) k-good if $Y = X^\alpha$, and a weakly PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle which is weakly k-good if Y is a PS submanifold of finite codimension that is closed in X.

The following is a generalization of Proposition 1.12.

Proposition 3.17 *(***Second localization formula***). Let (X, E, S) be an oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$ and $k \geq 1$, and the closed subset $Y \subset X$ be one of the above two classes of PS submanifolds. Assume also that (X, E, S) has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ and is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}$. Then there exist Euler chains M of (X, E, S) and N of $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ such that $M \cap Y = N$. Moreover, if the top strata of X and Y have no boundary (including corner), then the above M and N can be chosen as closed weakly k-PS manifolds. In particular, for a smooth map f from X to an oriented smooth manifold P of finite dimension, assume that it is transversal to an oriented closed submanifold $Q \subset P$ and $Y := f^{-1}(Q) \subset X$ is a PS Banach submanifold of finite codimension whose top stratum is contained in X_0. Then when both $e(E, S)$ and $e(E|_Y, S|_Y)$ exist, it holds that*

$$I_{Q*}(a) \cdot_P f_*(e(E, S)) = a \cdot_Q f_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y))$$

for any class $a \in H_*(Q, \mathbb{R})$ of codimension r, where $I_Q : Q \to P$ is the inclusion map, $\cdot_P$ (resp. $\cdot_Q$) is the intersection product in P (resp. Q).

Proof. Under the present assumptions it follows from the proof of Theorem 3.14 that there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in X, $\varepsilon > 0$ and PS sections $S_i : X \to E$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$, such that:

(i) • the PS section

$$\Phi : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_\mathcal{W}),\ y \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i(y)$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $r + m$ that is transversal to the zero section;

• the PS section

$$\Phi^Y : \mathcal{W} \cap Y \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}\cap Y}),\ y \mapsto S|_Y(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i|_Y(y)$$

is transversal to the zero section and is also a weakly k-Fredholm PS section (of index $r_\alpha + m$ in the case $Y = X^\alpha$ or $r_{\alpha_0} - n + m$ in another case).

(ii) Both zero sets $\Phi^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ and $(\Phi^Y)^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(\mathcal{W} \cap Y \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ are compact.

Let $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ be the set of the common regular values of both projections

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi^{-1}(0) \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto \mathbf{t} \quad \text{and}\\ &(\Phi^Y)^{-1}(0) \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto \mathbf{t}.\end{aligned}$$

Then as in the arguments below (3.4), for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{W} \to E,\ y \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i(y)$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section, and

$$\Phi^Y_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{W} \cap Y \to E|_Y,\ y \mapsto S|_Y(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma_i|_Y(y)$$

is a weakly k-Fredholm section that is transversal to the zero section. Since $\mathcal{W} \cap Y$ is an open neighborhood of $Z(S|_Y) = Z(S) \cap Y$ in Y, it is clear that

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) \cap Y = (\Phi^Y_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0). \tag{3.9}$$

This proves the first claim. The second claim is also obvious. Other conclusions may be easily proved as in Proposition 1.12 as well. □

Now let us state a generalization of Proposition 1.13. Let (X, E', S') (resp. (X, E'', S'')) be an oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle with rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}'$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}''$) and compact zero locus $Z(S')$ (resp. $Z(S'')$). Consider the direct sum $E = E' \oplus E''$, $S = S' \oplus S'' : X \to E$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}' \oplus \mathcal{A}''$. Clearly, $Z(S) = Z(S') \cap Z(S'')$, $Z(S) = Z(S'|_{Z(S'')})$, and (X, E, S) has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ near $Z(S)$. Suppose that both (X, E', S') and (X, E'', S'') are (weakly) k-good. We conclude:
- (X, E, S) is also (weakly) k-good.

In fact, for $x \in Z(S)$ let PS sections $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_m$ of E of class $\mathcal{A}$ be such that

$$DS(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(x), \cdots, \sigma_m(x)\}) = E_x.$$

Since $E_x = E'_x \oplus E''_x$, $DS(x)(v) = DS'(x)(v) \oplus DS''(x)(v)$ for $v \in T_xX$ and $\sigma_i = \sigma'_i \oplus \sigma''_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$, the above equality implies

$$\begin{aligned}DS'(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma'_1(x), \cdots, \sigma'_m(x)\}) &= E'_x,\\ DS''(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma''_1(x), \cdots, \sigma''_m(x)\}) &= E''_x.\end{aligned}$$

Hence that (X, E', S') and (X, E'', S'') are (weakly) k-good implies that there exist an open neighborhood $U(x)$ and $\eta > 0$ such that:

(i) • both sections

$$\Phi' : U(x) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E'|_{U(x)}),\ y \mapsto S'(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i\sigma'_i(y)$$

and

$$\Phi'' : U(x) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \Pi_1^*(E''|_{U(x)}),\ y \mapsto S''(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i''(y)$$

are (weakly) k-Fredholm PS sections of indexes $\mathrm{Index}(S') + m$ and $\mathrm{Index}(S'') + m$ respectively that are transversal to the zero section.

(ii) Both zero sets $(\Phi')^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(U(x) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ and $(\Phi'')^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(U(x) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ are compact.

Consider the PS section

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi : U(x) \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) &\to \Pi_1^*(E|_{U(x)}),\\ y &\mapsto S'(y) \oplus S''(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i \sigma_i'(y) \oplus \sigma_i''(y).\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, it is (weakly) k-Fredholm and transversal to the zero section (because its zero locus $Z(\Phi)$ is equal to $Z(\Phi') \cap Z(\Phi'')$). It follows that S is (weakly) k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, by the compactness of $Z(\Phi) = Z(\Phi') \cap Z(\Phi'')$ we get that $S = S' \oplus S''$ is also proper relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ near $Z(S)$. Hence (X, E, S) is (weakly) k-good.

Proposition 3.18 *Let (X, E', S') and (X, E'', S'') be as above, and have indexes r' and r'' respectively. Furthermore, assume that $DS''|_{Z(S)}$ is surjective and $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then*

(a) *For some small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in X the intersection $Z(S'')^\star := Z(S'') \cap \mathcal{U}$ is a weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r''. (In particular, the top stratum of $Z(S'')^\star$ is contained in X_0.)*

(b) *$D(S'|_{Z(S'')}) : (TZ(S''))|_{Z(S)} \to E'|_{Z(S)}$ is a PS Fredholm bundle map of index $\mathrm{Ind}(D(S'|_{Z(S'')}) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS)$ (which precisely means*

$$\mathrm{Ind}(D(S'|_{Z(S'')})(x)) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS(x))\ \forall x \in Z(S)\ ).$$

Moreover, if $(Z(S'')^\star, E'|_{Z(S'')^\star}, S'|_{Z(S'')^\star})$ is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}'|_{Z(S'')^\star}$ then there exist Euler chains N of it and M of (X, E, S) such that $M = N$. Furthermore, if both $e(E, S)$ and $e(E'|_{Z(S'')^\star}, S'|_{Z(S'')^\star})$ exist then M and N can be chosen as closed weakly k-PS manifolds, and therefore

$$e(E, S) = (i_{Z(S'')^\star})_* e(E'|_{Z(S'')^\star}, S'|_{Z(S'')^\star}).$$

Here $(i_{Z(S'')^\star})_*$ is the homomorphism between the homology groups induced by the inclusion $i_{Z(S'')^\star} : Z(S'')^\star \hookrightarrow X$.

Proof. (a) Since (X, E'', S'') is (weakly) k-good, S'' is (weakly) k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\mathcal{A}''$. Note that $DS''|_{Z(S)}$ is surjective. By Remark 3.11(i), for each $x \in Z(S)$ there exists a small open neighborhood $U(x)$ of x in X such that $S'' : U(x) \to E''|_{U(x)}$ is transversal the zero section. It follows from the compactness of $Z(S)$ that there exists a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in X such that $S'' : \mathcal{U} \to E''|_{\mathcal{U}}$ is transversal the zero section. Moreover, our assumption $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$ implies $Z(S') \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $Z(S'') \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$. So $Z(S'')^\star := Z(S'') \cap \mathcal{U}$ is a weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r'' and its top stratum is also intersecting with $Z(S'|_{Z(S'')}) = Z(S)$.

(b) Applying the first claim in Proposition 1.13(b) to each stratum of $Z(S'')^\star$ we immediately get the first conclusion.

To prove the second claim note that $Z(S'')^\star$ has finite dimension and $DS''|_{Z(S)}$ is surjective. We can find finitely many PS sections $S'_j : X \to E'$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$ such that for each $y \in Z(S)$,

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &D(S'|_{Z(S'')})(y)(T_y Z(S'')^\star) + \\ &\qquad \mathrm{span}(\{S'_1(y), \cdots, S'_m(y)\} = E'_y, \\ &DS'(y)(T_y X) + \mathrm{span}(\{S'_1(y), \cdots, S'_m(y)\} = E'_y, \\ &DS(y)(T_y X) + \mathrm{span}(\{S'_1(y), \cdots, S'_m(y)\} = E_y. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.10}$$

Since $(Z(S'')^\star, E'|_{Z(S'')^\star}, S'|_{Z(S'')^\star})$ is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}'|_{Z(S'')^\star}$, (X, E', S') is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}'$ and (X, E, S) is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A} \supset \mathcal{A}'$ it follows from (3.10) that there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $Z(S)$ in $\mathcal{U}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

(1°) The PS sections

$$\Phi : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to E,\ y \mapsto S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S'_i(y),$$

$$\Phi' : \mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to E',\ y \mapsto S'(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S'_i(y),$$

$$\Psi : \mathcal{W} \cap Z(S'')^\star \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m) \to E'|_{\mathcal{W} \cap Z(S'')^\star},$$

$$y \mapsto S'|_{Z(S'')}(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S'_i|_{Z(S'')}(y),$$

are (weakly) k-Fredholm and transversal to the zero section.

(2°) The zero sets $\Phi^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$, $(\Phi')^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(\mathcal{W} \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ and $(\Psi)^{-1}(0) \subset Cl(\mathcal{W} \cap Z(S'')^\star \times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ are all compact subsets.

Let $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ be the set of the common regular values of the following three projections

$$\Phi^{-1}(0) \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto \mathbf{t},$$
$$(\Phi')^{-1}(0) \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto \mathbf{t},$$
$$\Psi^{-1}(0) \to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto \mathbf{t}.$$

Then by Remark 3.11(iii), for each $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the PS sections

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{W} \to E|_{\mathcal{W}}, \quad x \mapsto S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S'_i(x),\\
&\Phi'_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{W} \to E'|_{\mathcal{W}}, \quad x \mapsto S'(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S'_i(x),\\
&\Psi_{\mathbf{t}} : \mathcal{W} \cap Z(S'')^\star \to E'|_{\mathcal{W} \cap Z(S'')^\star}, \quad x \mapsto S'(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m t_i S'_i(x),
\end{aligned}$$

are all (weakly) k-Fredholm and transversal to the zero section. Let $R_{\mathbf{t}} = \Phi'_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\mathcal{N}}$. Note that $\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} = \Phi'_{\mathbf{t}}$, $\mathrm{P}_{E''} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} = S''$ and $\mathrm{P}_{E'} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} + \mathrm{P}_{E''} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{t}} = \Phi_{\mathbf{t}}$. As in the proof of Proposition 1.13 we can derive that $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0) = R_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ small enough. By the assumptions, Φ, Φ' and Ψ have all zero loci intersecting with the top strata of their domains. For $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ small enough, $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$, $(\Phi'_{\mathbf{t}})^{-1}(0)$ and $\Psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ have nonempty intersections with the top strata of $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W} \cap Z(S'')^\star$ as well. The desired result follows. $\square$

Corresponding to Proposition 1.15 we easily get:

Proposition 3.19 *Let (X_i, E_i, S_i) be (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundles of index r_i and with compact zero locus $Z(S_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Assume that (X_1, E_1, S_1) (resp. (X_2, E_2, S_2)) is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_2$) and that $Z(S_1)$ (resp. $Z(S_2)$) has a nonempty intersection with the top stratum of X_1 (resp. X_2). Then the natural product $(X_1 \times X_2, E_1 \times E_2, S_1 \times S_2)$ is a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index $r = r_1 + r_2$ that is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$, and there exist Euler chains M_i of (X_i, E_i, S_i), $i = 1, 2$, such that the product weakly k-PS manifold $M = M_1 \times M_2$ is a Euler chain of $(X_1 \times X_2, E_1 \times E_2, S_1 \times S_2)$. Moreover, if $e(X_1, E_1)$ and $e(X_2, E_2)$ exist, then $e(E_1 \times E_2, S_1 \times S_2)$ also exists and M_i can be chosen as closed weakly k-PS manifolds, $i = 1, 2$.*

Similar to Proposition 1.16 we also have:

Proposition 3.20 *(**Homotopy**) Let $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ be oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundles of index r and with compact zero loci, and be also (weakly) k-good relative to the classes $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 0, 1$. They are said to be* **oriented homotopic** *if there exists an oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle $(X \times [0, 1], E, S)$ of index $r + 1$ and with compact zero locus that is (weakly) k-good relative to some class $\mathcal{A}$, such that $(X \times \{i\}, E|_{X \times \{i\}}, S|_{X \times \{i\}}) = (X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{X \times \{i\}} = \mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 0, 1$. In this case, if r-dimensional Euler classes $e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ and $e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ exist then these two Euler classes are same.*

We can also define the notion of a **morphism** from oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundles (X, E, S) to (X', E', S') and get a corresponding generalization of Proposition 1.17. A **PS Fredholm map of index** d from

PS Banach manifolds Y to X is a PS map whose restriction to the top stratum (resp. each lower stratum) is a Fredholm map of index d (resp. index less than or equal to d).

The following proposition is a generalization of Proposition 1.18. Its proof is still given for reader's conveniences.

Proposition 3.21 *Let (X,E,S) be a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S)$. Assume that $Z(S)\cap X_0\neq\emptyset$ and (X,E,S) is also (weakly) k-good relative some class $\mathcal{A}$. Let Y be another PS Banach manifold admitting PS cut-off functions with arbitrarily small support near any point, and $f:Y\to X$ be a proper PS Fredholm map of index d from Y to X. Assume that f is a PS submersion and $f^{-1}(X_0\cap Z(S))\cap Y_0\neq\emptyset$. Then the natural pullback (Y,f^*E,f^*S) is a weakly PS Banach k-Fredholm bundle of index $r+d$ and with compact zero locus $Z(f^*S)$ that is weakly k-good relative to the class $f^*\mathcal{A}$, and there exists a Euler chain M (resp. N) of (X,E,S) (resp. (Y,f^*E,f^*S)) such that $f^{-1}(M)=N$. Furthermore, if both Euler classes $e(E,S)$ and $e(f^*E,f^*S)$ exist then M and N can be chosen as closed weakly k-PS manifolds.*

As noted below Proposition 1.18, if $d=0$, X_0 is connected and the Euler classes $e(E,S)$ and $f_*(e(f^*E,f^*S))$ exist, then the final claim in Proposition 3.21 implies

$$f_*(e(f^*E,f^*S))=\deg(f)e(E,S)$$

for some kind topological degree $\deg(f)$ of f.

Proof. Since $Z(S)$ is compact, so is $Z(f^*S)=f^{-1}(Z(S))$ by the properness of f. Clearly, $f^{-1}(X_0\cap Z(S))\cap Y_0\neq\emptyset$ implies that $Z(f^*S)\cap Y_0\neq\emptyset$. From the proof of Proposition 1.18 it is not hard to see that pullback (Y,f^*E,f^*S) has index $r+d$. One also easily checks that (Y,f^*E,f^*S) has rich local PS sections of class $f^*\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, for $x\in Z(S)$ and PS sections of E, $S_1,\cdots,S_m$, assume that there exist an open neighborhood $U(x)$ of x in X and $\delta>0$ such that

$$\bigcup_{|\mathbf{t}|\le\delta} Cl(U(x))\cap(S+t_i\sum_{i=1}^m S_i)^{-1}(0)$$

is compact. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\bigcup_{|\mathbf{t}|\le\delta} f^{-1}(Cl(U(x)))\cap(f^*S+t_i\sum_{i=1}^m f^*S_i)^{-1}(0)\\ =&\bigcup_{|\mathbf{t}|\le\delta} f^{-1}\Big(Cl(U(x))\cap(S+t_i\sum_{i=1}^m S_i)^{-1}(0)\Big)\end{aligned}$$

is also compact because f is proper. So f^*S is locally proper relative to the class $f^*\mathcal{A}$.

We conclude that f^*S **is weakly k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to the class $f^*\mathcal{A}$.** In fact, for any $y \in Z(f^*S)$ assume that there exist PS sections $f^*\sigma_1, \cdots, f^*\sigma_p$ of f^*E of class $f^*\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$D(f^*S)(y)(T_yY) + \mathrm{span}(\{f^*\sigma_1(y), \cdots, f^*\sigma_p(y)\}) = (f^*E)_y = E_{f(y)}.$$

Then $x = f(y) \in Z(S)$ and

$$DS(x)(T_xX) + \mathrm{span}(\{f^*\sigma_1(y), \cdots, f^*\sigma_p(y)\}) = (f^*E)_y = E_{f(y)}.$$

because $D(f^*S)(y) = DS(x) \circ df(y)$ and $DS(x) \circ df(y)(T_yY) \subset DS(x)(T_xX)$. Note that S is (weakly) k-quasi transversal to the zero section. There exist an open neighborhood $U(x)$ of x and $\delta > 0$ such that the PS section

$$\Psi : U(x) \times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p) \to \Pi_1^*(E|_{U(x)}),\ (x, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S(x) + \sum_{i=1}^p t_i\sigma_i(x)$$

is (weakly) k-Fredholm and also transversal to the zero section. Take a small open neighborhood $V(y)$ of y so that $f(V(y)) \subset U(x)$. Consider the section

$$\begin{aligned} f^*\Psi : V(y) \times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p) &\to \Pi_1^*(f^*E|_{V(y)}), \\ (y, \mathbf{t}) &\mapsto f^*S(y) + \sum_{i=1}^p t_i(f^*\sigma_i)(y). \end{aligned}$$

For any zero $(y, \mathbf{t})$ of $f^*\Psi$, one easily checks that $(f(y), \mathbf{t}) \in Z(\Psi)$ and the vertical differentials of $f^*\Psi$ at $(y, \mathbf{t})$ is given by

$$D(f^*\Psi)(y, \mathbf{t})(\xi, \mathbf{u}) = D\Big(S + \sum_{i=1}^p t_i\sigma_i\Big)(f(y)) \circ df(y)(\xi) + \sum_{i=1}^p u_i\sigma_i(f(y)).$$

Let us prove that $D(f^*\Psi)(y, \mathbf{t})$ is surjective. For any given $\zeta \in (f^*E)_y = E_{f(y)}$. Since $D\Psi(x, \mathbf{t}) : T_xX \times \mathbb{R}^p \to E_x$ is surjective we have $(\eta, \mathbf{v}) \in T_xX \times \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $D\Psi(x, \mathbf{t})(\eta, \mathbf{v}) = \zeta$, i.e.

$$D\Big(S + \sum_{i=1}^p t_iS_i\Big)(x)(\eta) + \sum_{i=1}^p v_i\sigma_i(x) = \zeta.$$

Since f is a PS submersion there exists $\xi \in T_yY$ such that $df(y)(\xi) = \eta$. It follows that $D(f^*\Psi)(y, \mathbf{t})(\xi, \mathbf{v}) = \zeta$. Consequently, $f^*\Psi$ **is transversal to the zero section.**

Let $S^{\alpha t}, \sigma_i^{\alpha t} : W \subset U(x) \to E_z$ be the local representatives of the restrictions of S and σ_i to the stratum $U(x)_\alpha$, $i = 1, \cdots, p$. Then the restriction of Ψ to $U(x)_\alpha \times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p)$ has a local representative

$$\Psi^{\alpha t} : W \times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p) \to E_z,\ (u, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S^{\alpha t}(u) + \sum_{i=1}^p t_i\sigma_i^{\alpha t}(u).$$

Correspondingly, the restriction of $f^*\Psi$ to $V(y)_\alpha \times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p)$ has a local representative

$$(f^*\Psi)^{\alpha t} : f^{-1}(W) \times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p) \to E_z, (y, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto S^{\alpha t}(f(v)) + \sum_{i=1}^p t_i\sigma_i^{\alpha t}(f(y)).$$

Clearly, this representative may be viewed a composition of $\Psi^{\alpha t}$ with the Fredholm map

$$f^{-1}(W)\times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p)\to W\times B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p),\ (u,\mathbf{t})\mapsto (f(u),\mathbf{t})$$

of index $\mathrm{Ind}(f)$. As in the arguments of Remark 3.11(iii), one easily proves that $(f^*\Psi)^{\alpha t}$ is a Fredholm map of index

$$p+\mathrm{Ind}(S|_{U(x)_\alpha})+d_\alpha\le p+\mathrm{Ind}(S|_{U(x)_\alpha})+d.$$

It follows that $f^*\Psi$ is a weakly k-Fredholm PS section. Summarizing up the above arguments, we get that (Y, f^*E, f^*S) **is weakly k-good relative to the class $f^*\mathcal{A}$.**

In order to prove other conclusions, assume that

$$\Phi:\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\to\Pi_1^*(E|_{\mathcal{W}}),\ (x,\mathbf{t})\mapsto S(x)+\sum_{i=1}^m t_iS_i(x)$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $r+m$ that is transversal to the zero section. Since $Z(S)\cap X_0\ne\emptyset$, $\Phi^{-1}(0)$ is intersecting with the top strata of $\mathcal{W}\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Let $\mathcal{W}^*=f^{-1}(\mathcal{W})$. Consider the section

$$\begin{aligned}&f^*\Phi:\mathcal{W}^*\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\to\Pi_1^*(f^*E|_{\mathcal{W}^*}),\\ &\quad(y,\mathbf{t})\mapsto f^*S(y)+\sum_{i=1}^m t_i(f^*S_i)(y).\end{aligned}$$

For any $(y,\mathbf{t})\in Z(f^*\Phi)$, one easily checks that $(f(y),\mathbf{t})\in Z(\Phi)$ and the vertical differentials of $f^*\Phi$ at $(y,\mathbf{t})$ is given by

$$D(f^*\Phi)(y,\mathbf{t})(\xi,\mathbf{u})=D\Big(S+\sum_{i=1}^m t_iS_i\Big)(f(y))\circ df(y)(\xi)+\sum_{i=1}^m u_iS_i(f(y)).$$

As above we can prove that $D(f^*\Phi)(y,\mathbf{t})$ is surjective, and thus that $f^*\Phi$ **is transversal to the zero section.**

Let $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ be the set of the common regular values of the projections

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi^{-1}(0)\to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (x,\mathbf{t})\to\mathbf{t}\quad\text{and}\\ &(f^*\Phi)^{-1}(0)\to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m),\ (y,\mathbf{t})\to\mathbf{t}.\end{aligned}$$

Then it is a residual subset in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and for each $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ both the (weakly) k-PS sections $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}:\mathcal{W}\to E|_{\mathcal{W}}$ and $(f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}=f^*(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}):\mathcal{W}^*\to(f^*E)|_{\mathcal{W}^*}$ are transversal to the zero sections. (Note that $Z(f^*S)\cap Y_0\ne\emptyset$ implies that $(f^*\Phi)^{-1}(0)$ and the top strata of $\mathcal{W}^*\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ have a nonempty intersection.) So the sets

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0):=\{x\in\mathcal{W}\,|\,\Phi(x,\mathbf{t})=0\}\quad\text{and}\\ &(f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0):=\{y\in\mathcal{W}^*\,|\,f^*\Phi(x,\mathbf{t})=0\}\end{aligned}$$

are respectively compact weakly k-PS manifolds of dimensions r and $r+d$ for small $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. Now as in the proof of Proposition 1.16 we can prove that $f^{-1}(\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)) = (f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ for $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ small enough. Finally, it is clear that both $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ and $(f^*\Phi)_{\mathbf{t}}^{-1}(0)$ are closed weakly k-PS manifolds when the Euler classes $e(E,S)$ of dimension r and $e(f^*E, f^*S)$ of dimension $r+d$ exist. $\square$

Remark 3.22 The weakly k-Fredholm PS section may be defined for the weakly PS Banach Fredholm bundle. One only need to require that the restrictions of it to those strata which are not open in X have Fredholm indexes less at least k than the Fredholm index of the restriction of it to the (open) top stratum. In this case unless Propositions 3.17, 3.18 need be suitably modified other results in this section still hold.

In the constructions of Liu-Tian's virtual module cycles for Floer homology and Gromov-Witten invariants the uniformizer charts of PS Banach orbifolds are PS Banach manifolds. In Appendix D we shall prove the existence of PS cut-off functions on such PS Banach manifolds.

4 Virtual Euler chains and cycles of PS Banach Fredholm orbibundles

As said in Introduction our motivations in this paper come from the study of Floer homology and Gromov-Witten invariants theory. Our abstract versions of this section exactly contain applications needed in these two cases. We first give a general framework and then discuss two kinds of more concrete ones, Framework I and Framework II. They are respectively used to construct Gromov-Witten invariants and Floer homology.

4.1 A general framework

Let X be a (weakly) PS Banach manifold and $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ be the group of PS automorphisms of X. From now on saying **a finite group G acting on X** always means that G acts on X by PS automorphisms of X, i.e. a homomorphism representation $G \to \mathrm{Aut}(X)$.

In Definition 2.1, if $\widetilde{U}$ is required to be a connected open subset of a (weakly) PS Banach manifold (with corner) one gets the notion of a **(weakly) PS Banach orbifold chart** (or simply **(weakly) PS B-orbifold chart**) on X. Such a chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ is called **effective** if Γ_U acts on $\widetilde{U}$ effectively. Replacing the words "smooth", "diffeomorphism", "embedding" and "bundle open embedding") by "PS", "PS diffeomorphism", "PS embedding" and "PS bundle open embedding") in the other part of Section 2.1 one obtains all corresponding notions in the PS category, e.x. a **PS injection** from a (weakly) PS B-orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to another one $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$, a **(weakly) PS Banach orbifold**, and a **(weakly) PS Banach orbibundle** etc. In particular, a (weakly) PS Banach orbifold $(X, [\mathcal{A}])$ is called an **effective (weakly) PS Banach orbifold** if $[\mathcal{A}]$ contains an atlas $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of effective (weakly) PS Banach orbifold charts.

Before continuing our definitions we discuss stratifications of a PS Banach orbifold. Let $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ be two charts on X with $U \subset V$, and $\theta_{UV} = (\tilde{\theta}_{UV}, \gamma_{UV})$ be an injection from $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ to $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$. Assume that $\widetilde{U} = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_u} \widetilde{U}_a$ and $\widetilde{V} = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_v} \widetilde{V}_a$ are respectively stratification decompositions of $\widetilde{U}$ and $\widetilde{V}$. Correspondingly we have stratification decompositions $U = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_u} U_a$ and $V = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_v} V_a$ of U and V respectively. Since $\widetilde{\theta}_{UV}$ is a PS open embedding from $\widetilde{U}$ into $\widetilde{V}$, it must induce an injection $\iota_{uv} : \Lambda_u \to \Lambda_v$ preserving order such that for any $a \in \Lambda_u$ the restriction of $\widetilde{\theta}_{UV}$ to the stratum $\widetilde{U}_a$ is an open embedding into $\widetilde{V}_{\iota_{uv}(a)}$. Clearly, $\cup_{a \in \Lambda_v \setminus \iota_{uv}(\Lambda_u)} V_a$ is disjoint with U. Now we take a collection of PS Banach orbifold charts Ω on X such that supports of all charts in Ω forms an open cover of X. Note that each chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ in Ω gives a partially order set Λ_u via the stratification decomposition of U, $U = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_u} U_a$. Consider the disjoint union

$$\widehat{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) \in \Omega} \Lambda_u,$$

and introduce an equivalence in it as follows: For $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V)$ in Ω we call $a \in \Lambda_u$ and $b \in \Lambda_v$ **directly equivalence** if $U_a \cap V_b \neq \emptyset$, and **equivalence** if there exists a chain of charts in Ω, $(\widetilde{U}_i, \Gamma_{U_i}, \pi_{U_i})$, $i = 0, \cdots, n$ such that $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) = (\widetilde{U}_0, \Gamma_{U_0}, \pi_{U_0})$, $(\widetilde{V}, \Gamma_V, \pi_V) = (\widetilde{U}_n, \Gamma_{U_n}, \pi_{U_n})$ and there exist $a_i \in \Lambda_{u_i}$, $i = 0, \cdots, n$ such that $a_0 = a$, $a_n = b$ and a_i is directly equivalent to a_{i+1} for $i = 0, \cdots, n-1$. It is easily checked that this indeed defines an equivalence relation $\sim$ in $\widehat{\Lambda}$ and that the equivalence relation is also compatible with the partial order of each Λ_u. Thus the partial orders in all these Λ_u induce a partial order in $\Lambda = \widehat{\Lambda}/\sim$ (with a maximal element 0). It is not hard to prove that this partial order set Λ is unique up to a bijection preserving order, i.e. independent choices of chart covers of X. For $\alpha \in \Lambda$ let

$$X_\alpha = \bigcup_{(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U) \in \Omega} \bigcup_{a \in \Lambda_u, a \in \alpha} U_a$$

Then $X = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ is the stratification decomposition of X indexed by Λ, and for each chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ with stratification decomposition $\widetilde{U} = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_u} \widetilde{U}_a$ we have an injection preserving order, $\iota_u : \Lambda_u \to \Lambda$ to satisfy $U \cap X_{\iota_u(a)} = U_a$ for any $a \in \Lambda_u$. It is not hard to check that these X_α satisfy:

- Any two X_α and X_β with $\alpha \neq \beta$ are disjoint, and each point of X has a neighborhood that may only intersect with finitely many X_α.
- Each X_α, called a **stratum**, is a smooth Banach orbifold with corner whose topology assures the inclusion $X_\alpha \hookrightarrow X$ to be continuous.
- The stratum X_0, called the **top stratum** of X, is a nonempty open subset in X. Other strata cannot contain any interior point of X, and are called **lower strata**.
- For each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ the stratum X_α is relatively open in $\cup_{\beta \prec \alpha} X_\beta$ with respect to the induced topology from X. For any $\beta \in \Lambda$ with $\beta \prec \alpha$ and $\beta \neq \alpha$, the stratum X_β cannot contain any relative interior point of X_α in $\cup_{\beta \prec \alpha} X_\beta$.

The above arguments show that the stratification decomposition of X, $X = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$, is intrinsic. Similarly, we have a natural stratification decomposition of a weakly PS Banach orbifold indexed by a finite set which is not necessarily a partial order set.

Many corresponding terminology with ones in Section 3 can be naturally introduced. (They will be omitted and be directly used when we need because one easily understands them.) In particular, we point out that a **closed (weakly) PS Banach orbifold dimension** n is a compact (weakly) PS Banach orbifold whose lower strata have at least codimension two and whose top stratum is a n-dimensional Banach orbifold without corners (including boundary). Moreover, a topological subspace Z of a (weakly) PS Banach orbifold X is called a **(weakly) PS Banach suborbifold** of X if it is a (weakly) PS Banach orbifold with respect to the induced PS Banach orbifold structure obtained as follows: For each (weakly) PS Banach orbifold chart $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ of X with $U \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ there exists a (weakly) PS Banach submanifold $\widetilde{Z}_U \subset \widetilde{U}$ that is not only stable under Γ_U but also compatible with the inclusion map, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{Z}_U, \Gamma_U|_{\widetilde{Z}_U}, \pi_U|_{\widetilde{Z}_U})$ is a (weakly) PS Banach orbifold chart for Z.

Let $p : X \to E$ be a (weakly) PS Banach orbibundle whose definition is obtained by replacing the words "Banach orbifold", "Banach orbifold chart" and "smooth" in Definition 2.7 with the words "PS Banach orbifold", "PS Banach orbifold chart" and "PS" respectively. For a PS B-orbifold chart $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ on X let $(\widetilde{E}_W, \Gamma_W, \Pi_W)$ be the corresponding PS Banach orbibundle chart on E with it, and $\widetilde{p}_W : \widetilde{E}_W \to \widetilde{W}$ be the PS Banach bundle projection with $\pi_W \circ \widetilde{p}_W = p \circ \Pi_W$ on E_W. If $\widetilde{W} = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_w} \widetilde{W}_a$ is the stratification decomposition of $\widetilde{W}$, then $\widetilde{E}_W = \cup_{a \in \Lambda_w} (\widetilde{p}_W)^{-1}(\widetilde{W}_a)$ is the stratification decomposition of $\widetilde{E}_W$. It follows that $E = \cup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} p^{-1}(X_\alpha)$ is exactly the stratification decomposition of E which is obtained as the above construction of the stratification decomposition of X. Denote by $E_\alpha = p^{-1}(X_\alpha)$ and by p_α the restriction of p to E_α. Then each $p_\alpha : E_\alpha \to X_\alpha$ is a Banach orbibundle. Having these we have essentially same two methods to define a **weakly Fredholm PS section** and a **weakly k-Fredholm PS section**. The first is to replace the words "PS bundle" by "PS orbibundle" in Definition 3.5. To describe the second note that the restriction of each continuous section $S : X \to E$ to $W = \pi_W(\widetilde{W})$ has a unique Γ_W-equivariant lift $\widetilde{S}_W : \widetilde{W} \to \widetilde{E}_W$, called a **local lift** of S. A continuous section $S : X \to E$ is called **weakly Fredholm PS section** (resp. **weakly k-Fredholm PS section**, resp. **k-Fredholm PS section**) if each local lift $\widetilde{S}_W : \widetilde{W} \to \widetilde{E}_W$ as above is such a section in the sense of Definition 3.5. In particular, it restricts to a Fredholm section $S_\alpha : X_\alpha \to E|_{X_\alpha}$ on each stratum X_α of X. The **index** of S is defined as that of the top stratum restriction $S|_{X_0} : X_0 \to E|_{X_0}$. Correspondingly, the notions of the **weakly PS Banach Fredholm orbibundle** of index r, **weakly PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle** and **PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle** may be defined naturally. For example, a triple (X, E, S) consisting of a PS Banach orbibundle $p : E \to X$ and its weakly Fredholm section $S : X \to E$ (of index r) is called a **weakly PS Banach Fredholm orbibundle** (of index r). The Banach Fredholm bundle $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ is called a **local lift** of (X, E, S) over W. A weakly PS Banach Fredholm orbibundle (resp. (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle) (X, E, S) is called **oriented** if its top stratum $(X, E, S)_0 = (X_0, E|_{X_0}, S|_{X_0})$, as a Banach Fredholm orbibundle, is oriented.

Since there is no corresponding slice theorem for action of Lie groups on PS Banach manifolds, a **k-regular PS Banach orbifold** is defined as a PS Banach orbifold X on which each chart $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ of it is **k-regular** in the sense that *the fixed point set* $\mathrm{Fix}(g)$ *of each* $g \in \Gamma_U \setminus \mathrm{Ker}(\Gamma_W, \widetilde{W})$ *and the top stratum* $\widetilde{W}_0$ *of* $\widetilde{W}$ *intersects at the union of finitely many submanifolds of* $\widetilde{W}_0$ *of codimension at least k locally, i.e.* $\mathrm{Fix}(g) \cap \widetilde{W}_0$ *is locally the union of finitely many submanifolds of* $\widetilde{W}_0$ *of codimension at least* k. **Remark** that in Definition 3.1 of the PS Banach manifold we do not require that the top stratum is dense. So $\widetilde{W}_0$ and thus the regular point set of $\widetilde{W}_0$, $\widetilde{W}_0^\circ$ is not necessarily dense in $\widetilde{W}$. (The dense condition is needed if we make our construction in the category of effective PS Banach Fredholm orbibundles).

In the following, for simplicity, as in Sections 2.3-2.8 we *always assume*:
♣1 **all PS Banach orbifolds are effective and 1-regular,**
♣2 **all PS Banach orbifolds (or orbibundles) have dense top strata.**
(Of course, the second condition will be moved out if our arguments are not in the effective category, but in arbitrarily one.)

Then $\widetilde{W}_0$ and thus the regular point set of $\widetilde{W}_0$, $\widetilde{W}_0^\circ$, is open and dense in $\widetilde{W}$. It is sufficient for proving the action of Γ_I on $\widetilde{W}_I$ to be effective as in Claim 2.16.

For a compact subset $K \subset X$, one only need replace the words "Banach", "diffeomorphism" and "smooth" by "PS Banach", "PS diffeomorphism" and "PS" respectively in the arguments in § 2.2 and § 2.3, and then repeats word by word the constructions therein to get a system of virtual PS Banach bundles

$$\big(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widetilde{W}(K)\big) = \big\{(\widetilde{E}_I, \widetilde{W}_I), \pi_I, \Pi_I, \Gamma_I, \pi^I_J, \Pi^I_J, \lambda^I_J \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$$

corresponding with (2.15), and its resolution system of PS Banach bundles

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K)\big) = \big\{\big(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{W}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},$$

Then take the pairs of open sets $W^j_i \subset\subset U^j_i$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$ such that $U^1_i \subset W^2_i \subset\subset U^2_i \subset\subset \cdots \subset\subset W^{n-1}_i \subset\subset U^{n-1}_i \subset\subset W^n_i = W_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, and that $K \subset \cup^n_{i=1} W^1_i$. As in §2.3.2 we can use them to get a renormalization of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(K), \widehat{W}(K))$, another system of PS Banach bundles

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(K), \widehat{V}(K)\big) = \big\{\big(\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I\big), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}.$$

From the local expressions in (2.39) and (2.52) one easily sees that both maps $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ and $\hat{\Pi}^I_J$ are **partially smooth** in the present case. As in Lemma 2.30 we can prove that every PS section S of $E \to X$ may yield a global PS sections of the above PS Banach bundle systems, denoted by $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. The section $\widehat{S}$ is equivariant in the sense that each $\widehat{S}_I$ is Γ_I-equivariant. If S is weakly Fredholm (resp. (weakly) k-Fredholm), so is $\widehat{S}$, and $\mathrm{Ind}(S) = \mathrm{Index}(\widehat{S})$.

Note that our PS Banach orbifolds might not have PS cut-off functions even if each stratum (as a Banach orbifold) admits smooth cut-off functions. From now on we make the following:

Assumption 4.1 Each $x \in X$ admits PS cut-off functions with arbitrarily small supports.[8]

So we easily obtain:

Claim 4.2 *Under Assumption 4.1, for any PS B-orbifold chart* $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma_W, \pi_W)$ *on* X*, any point* $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}$ *and any neighborhood* $\widetilde{O}$ *of it there exists a PS cut-off function* δ *such that* $\mathrm{supp}(\delta) \subset \widetilde{O}$ *and* $\delta \equiv 1$ *near* $\tilde{x}$.

---

[8] It can be satisfied in the cases of Floer homology and GW-invariants, see Appendix D.

A weakly PS Banach Fredholm orbibundle (X, E, S) is called to have **rich local PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$** if each local lift $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ of it, as a weakly PS Banach Fredholm bundle, has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}(W)$.

Let (X, E, S) have rich local PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$. If $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ and $(\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{E}_V, \widetilde{S}_V)$ are any two local lifts of it with $W \cap V \neq \emptyset$, then for any $x \in W \cap V$, $\tilde{x}_w \in (\pi_W)^{-1}(x)$ and $\tilde{x}_v \in (\pi_V)^{-1}(x)$, as in Lemma 2.19 it follows from Lemma 2.4 that there exist small open connected neighborhoods $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)$ of $\tilde{x}_w$ and $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)$ of $\tilde{x}_v$, a PS diffeomorphism $\lambda_{WV} : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w) \to \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)$ that maps $\tilde{x}_w$ to $\tilde{x}_v$, and a group isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{WV} : \Gamma_W(\tilde{x}_w) \to \Gamma_V(\tilde{x}_v)$ such that

$$\lambda_{WV} \circ \phi = \mathcal{A}_{WV}(\phi) \circ \lambda_{WV}$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma_W(\tilde{x}_w)$. Here $\Gamma_W(\tilde{x}_w)$ is the isotropy group of Γ_W at $\tilde{x}_w$. Note also that the PS diffeomorphism λ_{WV} is unique up to composition with elements in $\Gamma_W(\tilde{x}_w)$ and $\Gamma_V(\tilde{x}_v)$. Shrinking $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)$ and $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)$ if necessary it follows from the properties of PS orbifold bundles that there exists a PS bundle isomorphism

$$\Lambda_{WV} : \widetilde{E}_W|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)} \to \widetilde{E}_V|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)}$$

which is a lifting of λ_{WV}, to satisfy

$$\Lambda_{WV} \circ \Phi = \boxed{\mathcal{A}_{WV}(\phi)} \circ \Lambda_{WV}$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma_W(\tilde{x}_w)$. Here

$$\Phi : \widetilde{E}_W|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)} \to \widetilde{E}_W|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)} \Big(\text{resp. } \boxed{\mathcal{A}_{WV}(\phi)} : \widetilde{E}_V|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)} \to \widetilde{E}_V|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_v)}\Big)$$

is the PS bundle isomorphism lifting of ϕ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{WV}(\phi)$) produced in the definition of PS orbifold bundles.

Now let $\tilde{\sigma}_v : \widetilde{V} \to \widetilde{E}_V$ be a PS section of class $\mathcal{A}(V)$. Then

$$\lambda_{WV}^*(\sigma) : \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w) \to \widetilde{E}_W|_{\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)},\ \tilde{y} \mapsto \Lambda_{WV}^{-1}\big(\sigma_v(\lambda_{WV}(\tilde{y}))\big)$$

is also a PS section. By Claim 4.2 we may take a PS cut-off function $\delta : \widetilde{W} \to [0, 1]$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(\delta) \subset \widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)$ and $\delta \equiv 1$ near $\tilde{x}_w$. Then

$$\delta \cdot \lambda_{WV}^*(\sigma) : \widetilde{W} \to \widetilde{E}_W, \tag{4.1}$$

is a PS section that equals $\lambda_{WV}^*(\sigma)$ near $\tilde{x}_w$ and has support contained in $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{x}_w)$. Adding all such PS sections of $\widetilde{E}_W$ to the class $\mathcal{A}(W)$ we get a new class of PS sections of $\widetilde{E}_W$, denoted by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W). \tag{4.2}$$

Corresponding with Definition 3.13 we introduce:

Definition 4.3 Let (X, E, S) be a weakly PS Banach Fredholm orbibundle (resp. a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle) with rich local PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$. It is called **good** (resp. **(weakly) k-good relative to class $\mathcal{A}$**) if the PS Banach orbifold X satisfies Assumption 4.1 and each local lift $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ of (X, E, S) is good (resp. (weakly) k-good relative to class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W)$ in the sense of Definition 3.13, i.e. the following two conditions are also satisfied:

(i) For each local lift $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ of (X, E, S) the PS section $\widetilde{S}_W$ is quasi (resp. (weakly) k-quasi) transversal to the zero section relative to class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W)$.

(ii) For each local lift $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ of (X, E, S) the PS section $\widetilde{S}_W$ is locally proper relative to class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W)$ near $Z(\widetilde{S}_W)$.

Moreover, (X, E, S) is called **smoothly good** (resp. **smoothly (weakly) k-good) relative to class $\mathcal{A}$** if the above condition (i) is replaced by
(**i**)$'$ For each local lift $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ of (X, E, S) the PS section $\widetilde{S}_W$ is smoothly quasi-transversal (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-quasi-transversal) to the zero section relative to class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W)$.

In the applications to Gromov-Witten invariants and Floer theory, the condition (i) or (**i**)$'$ in Definition 4.3 shall be checked by complicated gluing arguments.

From now on we assume that S **is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index** r **and with compact zero locus** $Z(S)$. As before we always write

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W}\big) = \big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(Z(S)), \widehat{W}(Z(S))\big), \quad \big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V}\big) = \big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(Z(S)), \widehat{V}(Z(S))\big).$$

As in Remark 2.34, for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ let us take pairs of open subsets $W_i^{+j} \subset\subset U_i^{+j}$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$ such that

$$W_i^j \subset\subset W_i^{+j} \subset\subset U_i^{+j} \subset\subset U_i^j, \ j = 1, \cdots, n-1.$$

Then one gets another renormalization of the PS bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{W})$,

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+, \widehat{V}^+) = \big\{\big(\widehat{F}_I^+, \widehat{V}_I^+\big), \hat{\pi}_I^+, \hat{\Pi}_I^+, \Gamma_I, \hat{\pi}_J^{+I}, \hat{\Pi}_J^{+I}, \lambda_J^I \ \big| \ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},$$

such that $Cl(V_I) \subset V_I^+$ and thus $Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widehat{V}_I^+$ for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and that $\hat{\pi}_I^+$, $\hat{\Pi}_I^+$, $\hat{\pi}_J^{+I}$ and $\hat{\Pi}_J^{+I}$ respectively restrict to $\hat{\pi}_I$, $\hat{\Pi}_I$, $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ and $\hat{\Pi}_J^I$.

Take the Γ_i-invariant PS cut-off functions[9] $\gamma_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to [0, 1]$ with support in $\widetilde{W}_i^1$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that

$$Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0, \tag{4.3}$$

where $U_i^0 = \pi_i(\widetilde{U}_i^0)$ and $\widetilde{U}_i^0 = \{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i \,|\, \gamma_i(\tilde{x}) > 0\}$. Let $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ be the unique Γ_i-equivariant lifts of $S|_{W_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Since $Cl(U_i^0) \subset W_i^1 \subset\subset W_i$ and $Z(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap Cl(\widetilde{W}_i^1) \subset \widetilde{W}_i$ are compact, and as in § 3 we can find finitely many PS sections of the PS Banach bundles $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$ of class $\mathcal{A}(W_i)$, $\tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$ such that

---

[9] Under Assumption 4.1 one might suspect the existence of such PS cut-off functions. If necessary, we can always shrink W_i and make suitable adjustments for completing arguments.

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{z})(T_{\tilde{z}}\widetilde{W}_i) + \mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{s}_{i1}(\tilde{z}), \cdots, \tilde{s}_{im_i}(\tilde{z})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{z}}$$

for any $\tilde{z} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap Cl(\widetilde{W}_i^1)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. (**Note**: the second condition in Definition 3.8 is used again!). Set $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij} = \tilde{\gamma}_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$. Then

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{y}) + \mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}_{i1}(\tilde{y}), \cdots, \tilde{\sigma}_{im_i}(\tilde{y})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{y}} \tag{4.4}$$

for any $\tilde{y} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap U_i^0$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n$. By Lemma 2.33 each $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ yields a global PS section $\hat{\sigma}_{ij} = \{(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the system of PS Banach bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$.

As in (2.82) and (2.83) let $m = m_1 + \cdots + m_n$ and consider the PS Banach bundle system

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V} \times \mathbb{R}^m\big) \qquad\qquad (4.5)\\ &= \big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbb{R}^m), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}_J^I, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}_J^I, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

and its (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section $\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon_I : \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I, \qquad\qquad (4.6)\\ &\Big(\hat{x}_I, \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\Big) \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)\\ &\qquad = \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I).\end{aligned}$$

Then $Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widehat{V}_I^+$ for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is naturally viewed as a PS section of $(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+, \widehat{V}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m)$. Let $\hat{u}_I \in Cl(\widehat{V}_I) \cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)$. Then $\Upsilon_I(\hat{u}_I, 0) = 0$ and it follows from (4.3) that $u_I = \hat{\pi}_I(\hat{u}_I) \in \cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$. So u_I sits in $U_{i_q}^0 \subset W_{i_q}$ for some $i_q \in I$ because of (2.69). As in (2.89), in the natural pullback charts of those in (2.87) and (2.88) we have the following local expression of Υ_I,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon_{Iq} : \widetilde{O}_{i_q} \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbf{P}_1^*(\widetilde{E}_{i_q}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_q}}), \qquad\qquad (4.7)\\ &\Big(\tilde{x}, \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\Big) \mapsto \tilde{S}_{i_q}(\tilde{x}) + \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde{x}))\big)\\ &\qquad = \tilde{S}_{i_q} + \sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_q}} t_{i_q j}\tilde{\sigma}_{i_q j} + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_q\}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}\tilde{\tau}_{ij}^q.\end{aligned}$$

Here $\tilde{\tau}_{ij}^q(\tilde{x}) = (\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_q i})^{-1}\big(\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_q i}(\tilde{x}))\big)$. Note that multiplying $\tilde{\tau}_{ij}^q$ by a PS cut-off function near $\tilde{u}_{i_q} \in \widetilde{O}_{i_q}$ gives a PS section of the PS Banach bundle $\widetilde{E}_{i_q} \to \widetilde{W}_{i_q}$ of class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W_{i_q})$. So by Definition 4.3 we get a small open neighborhood $O(\tilde{u}_{i_q})$ of $\tilde{u}_{i_q}$ in $\widetilde{O}_{i_q}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$(\mathbf{4.7})_1$ The restriction of the PS section Υ_{Iq} to $O(\tilde{u}_{i_q})\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section.

$(\mathbf{4.7})_2$ The closure of the set $(O(\tilde{u}_{i_q})\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\Upsilon_{Iq}^{-1}(0)$ in $Cl(O(\tilde{u}_{i_q}))\times\mathbb{R}^m\subset\widetilde{W}_{i_q}\times\mathbb{R}^m$ is compact.

It follows that there exists a neighborhood $U(\hat{u}_I)$ of $\hat{u}_I$ in $\widehat{V}_I^+$ such that:

$(\mathbf{4.7})_3$ The restriction of the PS section Υ_I to $U(\hat{u}_I)\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section.

$(\mathbf{4.7})_4$ The closure of the set $(U(\hat{u}_I)\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\Upsilon_I^{-1}(0)$ in $Cl(U(\hat{u}_I))\times\mathbb{R}^m\subset\widehat{V}_I^+\times\mathbb{R}^m$ is compact.

As before using the compactness of $Cl(\widehat{V}_I)\cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)\subset\widehat{V}_I^+$ we can find a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_I$ of $Cl(\widehat{V}_I)\cap Z(\widehat{S}_I)$ in $\widehat{V}_I^+$ such that:

$(\mathbf{4.7})_5$ The restriction of the PS section Υ_I to $\mathcal{U}_I\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section.

$(\mathbf{4.7})_6$ The set $(\mathcal{U}_I\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\Upsilon_I^{-1}(0)$ has a compact closure in $Cl(\mathcal{U}_I)\times\mathbb{R}^m\subset\widehat{V}_I^+\times\mathbb{R}^m$.

Take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $Z(S)$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}^*\subset(\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\mathcal{U}_I)\cap(\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0).$$

Then as before we have a system of PS Banach bundles

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)=\big\{(\widehat{F}_I^*,\widehat{V}_I^*),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\pi}_J^I,\hat{\Pi}_I,\hat{\Pi}_J^I,\hat{p}_I,\Gamma_I\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},$$

called the **restriction** of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}},\widehat{V})$ to the open subset $\mathcal{W}^*$. Clearly, $\widehat{V}_I^*\subset\widehat{V}_I$ and thus $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)\subset\widehat{V}_I^+$ for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$. Note that each global section $\hat{\sigma}=\{(\hat{\sigma})_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}},\widehat{V})$ restricts to a global section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)$, still denoted by $\hat{\sigma}$ without confusions. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finite by shrinking $\varepsilon>0$ and $\mathcal{W}^*$ we get:

Theorem 4.4 *There exists a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $Z(S)$ in X and $\varepsilon>0$ such that for the restriction bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)$ of $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}},\widehat{V})$ to $\mathcal{W}^*$ the restriction of the global section $\Upsilon=\big\{\Upsilon_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}$ to $(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))$ is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section. Consequently, for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ the set*

$$\widehat{\Omega}_I(S):=\{(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})\in\widehat{V}_I^*\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\,|\,\Upsilon_I(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})=0\}$$

is a weakly k-PS submanifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+m$ and has compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)\times\mathbb{R}^m\subset\widehat{V}_I^+\times\mathbb{R}^m$. They are compatible in the sense that for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$,

$$\hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I)\cap\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)\quad\text{and}$$

that for any $(\hat{x}_J,\mathbf{t})\in\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I)\cap\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)$ all

$$\frac{|\Gamma_I|-|\Gamma_I(\hat{x}_I)|+1}{|\Gamma_J|-|\Gamma_J(\hat{x}_J)|+1}=\prod_{i\in I\setminus J}(|\Gamma_i|-|\Gamma_J(\hat{x}_J)|^{1/|J|}+1)$$

elements of the inverse image $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}((\hat x_J,\mathbf{t}))$ *sit in* $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ *for any* $(\hat x_I,\mathbf{t})\in(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}((\hat x_J,\mathbf{t}))$*. So for*

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{W}^\circ_J:=\{\hat x_I\in\widehat{W}_J(S)\,|\,\Gamma_I(\hat x_I)=\{1\}\}\quad\text{and}\\ &\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)^\circ:=\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)\cap(\widehat{W}^\circ_J\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)),\end{aligned}$$

the restriction of the projection

$$\hat\pi^I_J:(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)\to\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)$$

to $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J\times B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m))\cap\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)^\circ$ *is a* $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$*-fold (regular) PS covering to* $\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\Omega}_J(S)^\circ$*. Moreover, if* (X,E,S) *is smoothly good (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-good) then the above each* $\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)$ *is a smooth manifold of dimension* $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+m$ *(though it is not necessarily equal to* $\widehat{\Omega}_I(S)^\circ$*).*

The remarks and conventions below Theorem 3.14 are also effective in this section.

From now on we also assume that X is **separable**, i.e. each stratum of it is separable. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is a finite set Theorem 4.4 and the Sard-Smale theorem immediately give:

Corollary 4.5 *There exists a residual subset* $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *such that for each* $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ *the global section* $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}=\{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ *of the PS Banach bundle system* $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*,\widehat{V}^*\big)$ *is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section and the set* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S):=(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0)$ *is a weakly k-PS submanifold of dimension* $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ *and with compact closure in* $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)\subset\widehat{V}^+_I\subset\widehat{W}^+_I$*. Here* $\mathbf{t}=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$ *and*

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I:\widehat{V}^*_I\to\widehat{F}^*_I,\ \hat x_I\mapsto\Upsilon_I(\tilde x,\mathbf{t})=\hat S_I(\hat x_I)+\sum^n_{i=1}\sum^{m_i}_{j=1}t_{ij}(\hat\sigma_{ij})_I(\hat x_I).$$

Moreover, the family

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)=\big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\,:\,I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}\tag{4.8}$$

is compatible in the sense that for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$*,*

$$\hat\pi^I_J\big((\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\quad\text{and}$$

that for any $\hat x_J\in\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$ *the inverse image* $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\hat x_J)$ *contains*

$$\frac{|\Gamma_I|-|\Gamma_I(\hat x_I)|+1}{|\Gamma_J|-|\Gamma_J(\hat x_J)|+1}=\prod_{i\in I\setminus J}(|\Gamma_i|-|\Gamma_J(\hat x_J)|^{1/|J|}+1)$$

elements and all sit in $(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ *for any* $\hat x_I\in(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\hat x_J)$*. So for each stratum* $\widehat{V}^*_{J\alpha}$ *of* $\widehat{V}^*_J$ *and*

$$\left.\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)_\alpha:=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\cap\widehat{V}^*_{J\alpha},\\ &\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ:=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\cap\widehat{V}^{*\circ}_J\quad\text{and}\\ &\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^{sing}:=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\cap\widehat{V}^{*sing}_J\end{aligned}\right\}\tag{4.9}$$

it also holds that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\hat{\pi}^I_J\big((\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\partial^k\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_\alpha\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\partial^k\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)_\alpha,\\ \hat{\pi}^I_J\big((\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ,\\ \hat{\pi}^I_J\big((\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^{sing}\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^{sing}\end{array}\right\}\tag{4.10}$$

where $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\partial^k\widehat{V}^*_{J\alpha}$ is the k-boundary of $\widehat{V}^*_{J\alpha}$ as defined in Definition A.6. Moreover, the restriction of the projection

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J:(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\to\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\tag{4.11}$$

to $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$ is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold (regular) PS covering to $\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ$. Note, as in §2, that each $\hat{\pi}_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)(\mathrm{resp.}\ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)^\circ)\to X$ is also proper. Furthermore, if (X,E,S) is smoothly good (resp. smoothly (weakly) k-good) then the above each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ (though it is not necessarily equal to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$), and each stratum $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_\alpha$ is a submanifold of it.

For the final claim the reader may refer to the proof of Theorem 3.14. Corresponding to Propositions 2.40, 2.44 we also have:

Proposition 4.6 **(i)** *For any given small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $Z(S)$ in $\cup_{i=1}^n W_i$ there exists $\epsilon\in(0,\varepsilon)$ such that $\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))\subset\mathcal{U}$ for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$.*

(ii) *If (X,E,S) is oriented then each weakly k-PS manifold $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ in (4.8) may be oriented naturally and the map $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ in (4.11) is orientation preserving for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$.*

(iii) *For any two $\mathbf{t}$, $\mathbf{t}'\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the families of weakly k-PS manifolds $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)=\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)|I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)=\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)|I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ are cobordant in the sense that there exist generic paths $\gamma:[0,1]\to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ from $\mathbf{t}$ to $\mathbf{t}'$ such that:*
(a) for $I\in\mathcal{N}$ the set

$$\Upsilon_I^{-1}(\gamma):=\bigcup_{t\in[0,1]}(\Upsilon_I^{\gamma(t)})^{-1}(0)\times\{t\}$$

*is a weakly k-PS manifold of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$ and with boundary $\{0\}\times\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\cup(-\{1\}\times\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S))$ (*Here (X,E,S) has been assumed to be oriented. Otherwise the negative sign before $\{1\}$ should be removed.*)*
(b) the family $\Upsilon^{-1}(\gamma)=\{\Upsilon_I^{-1}(\gamma)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ is compatible in the similar sense to (4.11);
(c) $\Upsilon_I^{-1}(\gamma)$ has a compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)\times[0,1]\subset\widehat{V}^+_I\times[0,1]$.

(iv) *Assume $\delta\in(0,\varepsilon]$ so that the closure of $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ in $\cup_{i=1}^n W_i$ may be contained in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V^*_I$ for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)$. (This is always possible by (i) and Theorem 4.4.) Then for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ the set $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ is compact. Consequently, the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)=\big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}$ is "like" an open cover of a compact weakly k-PS manifold. Specially, each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is a finite set provided that $\mathrm{Ind}(S)=0$.*

Proof. (i) The claim can be proved by completely repeating the proof of Proposition 2.40(i).

(ii) Combining the proof of Proposition 2.44 with that of Theorem 3.14(ii.3) one can complete the proof.

(iii) Let $\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')$ denote the space of all C^l-smooth paths $\gamma:[0,1]\to B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ from $\mathbf{t}$ to $\mathbf{t}'$. It is a Banach manifold. Consider the obvious pullback PS Banach bundle system

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\times\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')\times[0,1]\big)\\ &=\big\{\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^*\times\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')\times[0,1]\big), \hat\pi_I, \hat\pi_J^I, \hat\Pi_I, \hat\Pi_J^I, \hat p_I, \Gamma_I\;\big|\; J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}\end{aligned}$$

and its global section $\Psi=\{\Psi_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi_I:\widehat{V}_I^*\times\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')\times[0,1]\to\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I^*,\\ &(\hat x_I,\gamma,s)\mapsto\hat S_I(\hat x_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\gamma(s)_{ij}(\hat\sigma_{ij})_I(\hat x_I).\end{aligned}$$

Here $\gamma(s)=\{\gamma(s)_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$, $\mathbf{P}_1$ is the projection to the first factor. As in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.14(ii.4) we can prove that Ψ_I is transversal to the zero section. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is finite, the standard arguments yields a residual subset $\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')_{reg}\subset\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')$ such that for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ and $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')_{reg}$ the PS section

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi_I^\gamma:\widehat{V}_I^*\times[0,1]\to\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I,\\ &(\hat x_I,s)\mapsto\hat S_I(\hat x_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\gamma(s)_{ij}(\hat\sigma_{ij})_I(\hat x_I)\end{aligned}$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$ that is transversal to the zero section. That is, for each $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')_{reg}$ the global section $\Psi^\gamma=\{\Psi_I^\gamma\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of the pullback PS Banach bundle system

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\times[0,1]\big)\\ &=\big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^*\times[0,1]), \hat\pi_I, \hat\pi_J^I, \hat\Pi_I, \hat\Pi_J^I, \hat p_I, \Gamma_I\;\big|\; J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S)+1$ that is transversal to the zero section. It follows that for each $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}^l(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')_{reg}$ and $I\in\mathcal{N}$ the weakly k-PS manifold with boundary (and corner)

$$(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0)=\big\{(\hat x_I,s)\in\widehat{V}_I^*\times[0,1]\,|\,\Psi_I(\hat x_I,\gamma,s)=0\big\}\tag{4.12}$$

forms a cobordism between the weakly k-PS manifolds $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)$. This completes the proof of (a) in (iii).

The conclusion of (b) in (iii) is obtained naturally. In order to prove (c) in (iii), note that $\Upsilon_I^{\gamma(s)}(x)=\Psi_I^\gamma(x,s)$ for $(x,s)\in\widehat{V}_I^*\times[0,1]$. Let $(\hat x_{Ik},s_k)\in(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0)$ and $s_k\to s_0\in[0,1]$. Then

$$\hat S_I(\hat x_{Ik})+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\gamma(s_k)_{ij}(\hat\sigma_{ij})_I(\hat x_{Ik})=0$$

for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, and $\gamma(s_k)_{ij} \to \gamma(s_0)_{ij}$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$ as $k \to \infty$. By Theorem 4.4 the sequence $\{(\hat{x}_{Ik}, \gamma(s_k))\}$ has a convergent subsequence in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \times \mathbb{R}^m \subset \widehat{V}_I^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m$. It follows that $\{\hat{x}_{Ik}\}$ has a convergence subsequence in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \subset \widehat{V}_I^+$. Hence $\Upsilon_I^{-1}(\gamma) = (\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0)$ has a compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \times [0,1] \subset \widehat{V}_I^+ \times [0,1]$. (iii) is proved.

(iv) The proof can be obtained by replaceing the word "manifold" therein by "PS manifold", and Corollary 2.39 by Corollary 4.5 in the proof of Proposition 2.40(iii). □

As in Remark 2.43, if $Z(S) \subset \text{Int}(X))$ then PS manifold $(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0)$ in (4.12) has only boundary but no corner for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. In this case the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is "like" an open cover of a compact weakly k-PS manifold. If $Z(S) \cap \partial X \neq \emptyset$ then the PS manifold $(\Psi_I^\gamma)^{-1}(0)$ might have only boundary but corner.

Clearly, if S is transversal to the zero section so is the section $\widehat{S} = \{\widehat{S}_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. In this case $S^{-1}(0)$ is a compact PS orbifold of dimension $\text{Ind}(S)$ and $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. It follows from Proposition 4.6 that $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}} \hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{0}}(S)) = S^{-1}(0)$ and that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{0}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{0}}(S) : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is cobordant to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ for any $\mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$. Actually, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ is exactly a resolution of the PS orbifold $S^{-1}(0)$.

4.2 Framework I

This framework is designed for the application to the (closed string) Gromov-Witten invariants. We shall develop our theory in a weaker framework though what is needed in GW-theory as in [LiT] is the case that (X, E, S) is a (weakly) PS 1-Fredholm orbibundle which is smoothly (weakly) 1-good and satisfies Assumptions 4.1, 4.7.

From now on, besides the assumptions in Section 4.1 we also assume that $k \geq 1$ and

- (X, E, S) is **oriented**,
- all PS Banach orbifolds satisfy Assumption 4.1.

As before let X_0 be the top strata of X. Denote by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(X_0),$$
$$\partial^i \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(\partial^i X_0) \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In this subsection we also write $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 = \partial^1\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0$. By (4.10) it holds that for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0\big) &= \text{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0, \\ \hat{\pi}_J^I\big((\hat{\pi}_J^I)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J^*) \cap \partial^i\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0\big) &= \text{Im}(\hat{\pi}_J^I) \cap \partial^i\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.13}$$

In order to use the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S), \mathbf{t} \in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ constructing the virtual Euler class we need to make a stronger assumption than 1-regularity of X:

Assumption 4.7 The top stratum X_0 of X is contained in the regular part X° of X.

If we only discuss the results on the level of chains, this assumption is not actually needed. Under Assumption 4.7 the top stratum $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0$ is contained in the regular part $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ and other strata of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ have at most dimension $r-2$. As in Section 2.6 we can use the family $\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ to construct a family of cobordant rational singular chains of dimension $\mathrm{Ind}(S)$ in X, denoted by

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} := \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\big\{\hat\pi_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \to X\big\}\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}. \tag{4.14}$$

Then as before the boundary of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is given by

$$\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\big\{\hat\pi_I : \partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \to X\big\}. \tag{4.15}$$

Corresponding with Claim 2.46 we have:

Claim 4.8 *$\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is a rational singular cycle in X and the class of it, $[\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}]$, is zero in $H_{r-1}(X,\mathbb{Q})$.*

As in Remark 2.43(iii) let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation in the disjoint union $\coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0$ generated by setting $\hat y_I \sim \hat z_J$ if $J \subset I$ and $\hat\pi^I_J(\hat y_I) = \hat z_J$. Denote by

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 := \coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0/\sim \tag{4.16}$$

and by $\hat q_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0$ the restriction of the obvious quotient map to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0$. Since $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$ we have a well-defined label function

$$\lambda : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 \to \mathbb{Q},\ \bar x \mapsto \frac{|\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|}{|\Gamma_I|} \quad \text{if } \bar x \in \mathrm{Im}(\hat q_I), \tag{4.17}$$

where $|\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|$ is the number of elements in the set $\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)$ and $\hat x_I$ is any element in $\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)$. With the same way we also define

$$\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 := \coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0/\sim \tag{4.18}$$

Then the label function above naturally restricts to it, and all $\hat\pi_I$, $I \in \mathcal{N}$, can be glued into a map $\hat\pi$ from $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0$ to X. It is not hard to check that as rational singular chains in X,

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = [\hat\pi : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 \to X]. \tag{4.19}$$

If the top stratum X_0 is a Banach orbifold without boundary and corner, then for $\mathbf{t}$ sufficiently small $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is a rational singular cycle in X, called a **virtual Euler cycle** of the triple (X,E,S), and its homology class

$$e(E,S) = [e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}] \in H_r(M,\mathbb{Q}) \tag{4.20}$$

is said to be the **virtual Euler class** of the triple. Combining the above arguments with ones in Section 2.6 we can also prove that the homology class $e(E,S)$ is independent of choices of the PS section $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ of class $\mathcal{A}$ and open subsets W_i.

Now we begin to discuss the properties of the virtual Euler cycle (class) of the (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundles. Their proofs can be obtained by combining those of the corresponding properties in § 2 and § 3, and are left to the interested readers. We only point out the places where some differences shall occur.

Let (X,E,S) be as above and $\Lambda\subset Z(S)$ be a nonempty compact subset. As in Section 2.7, if one only requires:
(i) $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an open cover of Λ,
(ii) $\mathcal{W}^*$ is an open neighborhood of Λ, denoted by $\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)$,
then we get the corresponding systems of PS Banach bundles,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(\Lambda),\widehat{W}(\Lambda)\big)&:=\big\{\big(\widehat{E}_I,\widehat{W}_I\big),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\Pi}_I,\Gamma_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\hat{\Pi}^I_J,\lambda^I_J\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\\
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\Lambda),\widehat{V}(\Lambda)\big)&:=\big\{\big(\widehat{F}_I,\widehat{V}_I\big),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\Pi}_I,\Gamma_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\hat{\Pi}^I_J,\lambda^I_J\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},\\
\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*(\Lambda),\widehat{V}^*(\Lambda)\big)&:=\big\{\big(\widehat{F}^*_I,\widehat{V}^*_I\big),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\Pi}_I,\Gamma_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\hat{\Pi}^I_J,\lambda^I_J\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where V_I, $\widehat{V}_I$, $\widehat{F}_I$ (resp. V_I^*, $\widehat{V}_I^*$, $\widehat{F}_I^*$) are defined as in (2.65) and (2.66) (resp. (2.71)). Corresponding with the sections $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}=\{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ in Corollary 4.5 we have a family of (weakly) k-Fredholm PS sections of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*(\Lambda),\widehat{V}^*(\Lambda)\big)$,

$$\Big\{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}(\Lambda)=\{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}\;\Big|\;\mathbf{t}=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)\Big\},$$

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda):\widehat{V}^*_I\to\widehat{F}^*_I,\;\hat{x}_I\mapsto\Upsilon_I(\hat{x},\mathbf{t})=\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

and a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res}$ of $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ the following are true.
(a) For each $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res}$ the PS section $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda)$ is a (weakly) k-Fredholm section that is transversal to the zero section,
(b) $(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda))^{-1}(0)$ is a PS manifold with compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)\subset\widehat{V}^+_I$,
(c) For any $\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}'\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res}$ the corresponding PS manifolds $(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda))^{-1}(0)$ and $(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')}_I(\Lambda))^{-1}(0)$ are cobordant.
So we get a family of cobordant rational chains near Λ of dimension r, denoted by

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_\Lambda:=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)_0\to X\}\;\forall\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^\Lambda_{res},$$

and called **virtual Euler chains relative to** Λ of the triple (X,E,S). Here $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda):=(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I(\Lambda))^{-1}(0)$ is a weakly k-PS manifold of dimension r and with compact closure in $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)\subset\widehat{V}^+_I$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)_0$ is the top stratum of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)$, i.e., $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)_0=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)\cap(\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(X_0)$.

Let P be a smooth orbifold of finite dimension and $f : X \to P$ be a PS map. If $\alpha \in H^r(P, \mathbb{R})$ has a differential form representative α^* such that the support $\mathrm{supp}(f^*\alpha^*)$ of $f^*\alpha^*$ is contained in Λ then we can define the integration

$$\int_{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Lambda}} f^*\alpha^* := \text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)_0}(f\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\alpha^*. \tag{4.21}$$

Here the integration in the right side is understand as follows: Multiply the form $f^*\alpha^*$ by a PS function to $[0,1]$ which is 1 outside a small neighborhood of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S,\Lambda)_0$ and 0 inside a smaller neighborhood and then pass to a limit as these neighborhoods get smaller. As before, $\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$ is put in double quotation marks in (4.21) because the repeating part is only counted once. Corresponding with Proposition 2.50 and Proposition 3.16 we have:

Proposition 4.9 *(***First localization formula***). Let Assumption 4.7 be satisfied so that the virtual Euler class $e(E,S)$ is well-defined as in (4.14). Then there exists a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^{\star}_{res}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^{\Lambda}_{res}$ such that*

$$\langle e(E,S), f^*\alpha\rangle = \int_{e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Lambda}} f^*\alpha^*$$

for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)^{\star}_{res}$.

As above Proposition 2.51, if $e(E,S)$ exists and Λ_i, $i=1,\cdots,p$, are all connected components of $Z(S)$, then one can start from these Λ_i to construct homology classes $e(E,S)_{\Lambda_i}\in H_r(X,\mathbb{Q})$, $i=1,\cdots,p$ such that

$$e(E,S)=\sum_{i=1}^{p} e(E,S)_{\Lambda_i}.$$

Let (X,E,S) be as above and $X=\cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda}X_\alpha$ be the stratification decomposition of X. Denote by r_α the index of the restriction of S to X_α. Then for each $\alpha\in\Lambda$, $X^\alpha := \cup_{\beta\prec\alpha}X_\beta$ is a PS Banach suborbifold of X, and $(X^\alpha, E|_{X^\alpha}, S|_{X^\alpha})$ is also a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle of index r_α. Moreover, a PS suborbifold $Y=\cup_{\alpha\in\Lambda_0}Y_\alpha\subset X$ indexed by a partial order subset $\Lambda_0\subset\Lambda$ with the maximal element α_0 is said to have **finite codimension** n if the top stratum Y_{α_0} of Y is a Banach suborbifold of codimension n in X_{α_0} and other strata of Y have at least finite codimension n in the corresponding strata of X. As arguments below Proposition 3.16, $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is only a **weakly** PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle of index $r_{\alpha_0}-n$. When Y is closed in X, $Z(S|_Y)$ is also closed and thus compact in Y by the compactness of $Z(S)$ in X. In the following we **always consider these two kinds of PS suborbifolds and assume that they are closed in** X. Then $(Y,E|_Y,S|_Y)$ is also a PS Banach Fredholm orbibundle with rich PS sections of $\mathcal{A}|_Y$, where $\mathcal{A}|_Y$ is the class of PS sections of $E|_Y$ obtained by restricting the PS sections of E of class $\mathcal{A}$ to Y.

Note that each local lift $(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{E}_W, \widetilde{S}_W)$ of (X, E, S) with $W \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ restricts to a natural lift of $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$,

$$(\widetilde{W}^y, \widetilde{E}^y_W, \widetilde{S}^y_W) = \big(\pi_W^{-1}(W \cap Y), \widetilde{E}_W|_{\pi_W^{-1}(W\cap Y)}, \widetilde{S}_W|_{\widetilde{S}_W}\big). \tag{4.22}$$

Since Y is closed in X one may easily prove that $\widetilde{S}^y_W$ is locally proper relative to class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W \cap Y)$ near $Z(\widetilde{S}^y_W)$. Here $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W \cap Y)$ denotes the class of those sections consisting of the restrictions of the PS sections in $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W)$ to $\widetilde{W}^y$.

Carefully checking arguments above Proposition 3.17 and ones between Claim 4.2 and Definition 4.3 we can prove that $\widetilde{S}^y_W$ is weakly k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(W \cap Y)$. So we get

$(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is a (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle which is (weakly) k-good if $Y = X^\alpha$, and a weakly PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle which is weakly k-good if Y is a PS suborbifold of finite codimension that is closed in X.

The following is a generalization of Proposition 2.51 and Proposition 3.17.

Proposition 4.10 *(***The restriction principle***). Let (X, E, S) be an oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle of index r and with compact zero locus, have rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ and be (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that a closed subset $Y \subset X$ belongs to one of the above two classes of PS suborbifolds.* [10] *Assume also that Y is* **flat** *in X in the sense that* for each point $y \in Y$ and each open neighborhood U of it in X there exists another open neighborhood $V \subset U$ of y in X such that $Cl(V \cap Y) = Cl(V) \cap Y$. *Then there exist a family of cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple (X, E, S),*

$$e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}'} = \text{``}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}'}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)_0 \to X\} \; \forall \mathbf{t}' \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res},$$

and another family of cobordant virtual Euler chains of $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$,

$$e(E|_Y, S|_Y)^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{``}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}^y_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)_0 \to Y\} \; \forall \mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m})_{res},$$

such that for

$$\mathbf{t}' = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1 \le j \le m_i \\ 1 \le i \le n'}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{t} := \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1 \le j \le m_i \\ 1 \le i \le n}}$$

one has

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}
\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(Y) = \emptyset \; \forall I \in \mathcal{N}' \setminus \mathcal{N}, \\
\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(Y), \\
\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)^\circ = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^\circ \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(Y), \\
\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)^{sing} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)^{sing} \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(Y), \\
\hat{\pi}^{yI}_J = \hat{\pi}^I_J|_{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)}
\end{array}\right\}$$

---

[10] Actually we only need to assume that some closed neighborhood of $Z(S|_Y)$ in Y is flat in X.

for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $J \subset I$. It follows that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y)^\circ = \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ \cap \hat{\pi}^{-1}(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\pi}^y = \hat{\pi}|_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y)^\circ}.$$

Roughly speaking, $e(E|_Y, S|_Y)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is the intersection of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}'}$ with Y.

It should be noted that if $Y \cap X_0 = \emptyset$ then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S)^\circ \cap \hat{\pi}^{-1}(Y) = \emptyset$. In this case even if both classes $e(E|_Y, S|_Y)$ and $e(E,S)$ exist we cannot get any relation between them. However, this restriction principle is convenient for understanding relations among chains.

Proof of Proposition 4.10. This result can be obtained by almost repeating the proof of Proposition 2.51. We only give different arguments. The first is to omit the second sentence " One can check that Assumption 2.45 also holds for the suborbifold Y." in the proof of Proposition 2.51. Next, in the present case the corresponding result with (2.125) cannot be obtained. The purpose that we assume Y to be flat is for getting it.

Finally, let us replace the arguments below (2.127) as follows. Recall the arguments between (4.3) and (4.4). We have the Γ_i-invariant PS cut-off functions $\gamma_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to [0,1]$ with support in $\widetilde{W}_i^1$, $i = 1, \cdots, n'$ such that $Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{n'} U_i^0$, where $U_i^0 = \pi_i(\widetilde{U}_i^0)$ and $\widetilde{U}_i^0 = \{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i \,|\, \gamma_i(\tilde{x}) > 0\}$. Let $\widetilde{S}_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i$ be unique Γ_i-equivariant lifts of $S|_{W_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n'$. Since $Cl(U_i^0) \subset W_i^1 \subset\subset W_i$, using the compactness of $Z(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap Cl(\widetilde{W}_i^1) \subset \widetilde{W}_i$ and the assumption of richness we can find finitely many PS sections of the PS Banach bundle $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$ of class $\mathcal{A}(W_i)$, $\tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$ such that

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{z})(T_{\tilde{z}}\widetilde{W}_i) + \mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{s}_{i1}(\tilde{z}), \cdots, \tilde{s}_{im_i}(\tilde{z})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{z}}$$

for any $\tilde{z} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap Cl(\widetilde{W}_i^1)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n'$. Set $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij} = \tilde{\gamma}_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m_i$. Then

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{z}) + \mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}_{i1}(\tilde{z}), \cdots, \tilde{\sigma}_{im_i}(\tilde{z})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{z}}$$

for any $\tilde{z} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_i) \cap Cl(U_i^0)$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n'$. By Lemma 2.33 each $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ yields a global PS section $\hat{\sigma}_{ij} = \{(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the system of PS Banach bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V})$.

Note that for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$, the restriction

$$\widetilde{S}_i^y = \widetilde{S}_i|_{\widetilde{W}_i^y} : \widetilde{W}_i^y \to \widetilde{E}_i^y$$

is exactly the lift of the restriction $S|_{W_i^y}$, and the restriction of γ_i to $\widetilde{W}_i^{y1}$, denote by γ_i^y, has support contained in $\widetilde{W}_i^{y1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{U}_i^{y0} := \{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_i^y \,|\, \gamma_i^y(\tilde{x}) > 0\} = \widetilde{U}_i^0 \cap \widetilde{W}_i^y \subset\subset \widetilde{W}_i^{y1} \quad \text{and} \\
&Z(S|_Y) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i^{y0} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \pi_i(\widetilde{U}_i^{y0}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{s}_{ij}^y$ denote the restriction of $\tilde{s}_{ij}$ to W_i^y. Define sections

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^y := \gamma_i^y \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}^y : \widetilde{W}_i^y \to \widetilde{E}_i^y, \ j = 1, \cdots, m_i.$$

They are restrictions of $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ to W_i^y. Since both the sections $\widetilde{S}_i$ and $\widetilde{S}_i^y$ are weakly k-Fredholm, by increasing m_i we may assume

$$D\widetilde{S}_i^y(\tilde{z}) + \mathrm{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}_{i1}^y(\tilde{z}), \cdots, \tilde{\sigma}_{im_i}^y(\tilde{z})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_i^y)_{\tilde{z}}$$

for any $\tilde{z} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_i^y) \cap Cl(U_i^{y0})$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

By the assumptions, (X, E, S) is (weakly) k-good relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ and $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ is weakly k-good relative to class $\mathcal{A}|_Y$ as showed above Proposition 4.10. As the arguments below (4.5) we use these to get a global PS section of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t}')} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t}')}\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}'\}$ given by

$$\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t}')} : \widehat{V}_I^* \to \widehat{F}_I^*,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

and that of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{y*}, \widehat{V}^{y*}\big)$, $\Upsilon^{y(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon_I^{y(\mathbf{t})}\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ given by

$$\Upsilon_I^{y(\mathbf{t})} : \widehat{V}_I^{y*} \to \widehat{F}_I^{y*},\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I^y(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^y)_I(\hat{x}_I).$$

Here $\mathcal{N} = \{I \in \mathcal{N}' \,|\, \max I \le n\}$. Furthermore we can find a small $\varepsilon > 0$ and a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})$, $m' = \sum_{i=1}^{n'} m_i$ such that for any

$$\mathbf{t}' = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n'}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{t} := \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$$

the above PS sections $\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t}')}$ and $\Upsilon_I^{y(\mathbf{t})}$ are all weakly k-Fredholm PS sections that are transversal to the zero section (by shrinking $\mathcal{W}^*$ and increasing n and n' if necessary). (Note that when $\mathbf{t}'$ takes over $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^{m'})_{res}$ all corresponding $\mathbf{t} := \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$ form a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$.) Set

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}(S) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}'}(S) = (\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t}')})^{-1}(0) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}'\big\} \quad \text{and} \\ &\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(S|_Y) = (\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})})^{-1}(0) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}, \end{aligned}$$

and repeat the remnant arguments in the proof of Proposition 2.51 to arrive at the desired conclusions. □

Recall that Proposition 2.51 is used in the proofs of Propositions 2.54, 2.56 and 2.57. When proving the corresponding result with 2.56, i.e., the following Proposition 4.14, we need the flatness of $Y = X \times \{i\}$ in $X \times [0, 1]$, $i = 0, 1$. These hold obviously. However, for the corresponding results with Propositions 2.54 and 2.57, i.e., the following Proposition 4.12 and 4.15 we shall add this condition.

Corollary 4.11 *(***Second localization formula***). Let $f : X \to P$ be a PS map from X to an oriented smooth orbifold of finite dimension, and $Q \subset P$ be an oriented closed suborbifold of dimension m such that*

(i) $Y := f^{-1}(Q) \subset X$ *is a PS Banach suborbifold of codimension* $\dim P - m$*,*
(ii) Y *is flat in* X *and satisfies Assumption 4.7,*
(iii) the top stratum of Y*,* Y_0*, is contained in the top stratum* X_0 *of* X*.*
Assume also that $e(E,S)$ *exists and that* $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ *is orientable and* $e(E|_Y, S|_Y)$ *exists (after choosing an orientation of it). Then for any class* $\kappa \in H_*(Q, \mathbb{R})$ *of dimension* $\dim P - r$ *it holds that*

$$\langle PD_Q(\kappa), f_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y))\rangle = \langle PD_P(\kappa), f_*(e(E,S))\rangle.$$

Here $PD_Q(a)$ *(resp.* $PD_P(a)$*) is the Poincaré duality of* a *in* $H^*(Q,\mathbb{R})$ *(resp.* $H^*(P,\mathbb{R})$*).*

Since $Y_0 \subset X_0$, $(Y, E|_Y, S|_Y)$ has index $r - \dim P + m$ and it follows from Proposition 4.10 that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S|_Y)_0 = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S) \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(Y_0) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(S)_0 \cap \hat{\pi}_I^{-1}(Y)$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$. The desired equality can be obtained as in the proof of Proposition 1.12. If the top stratum of Y can be contained a lower stratum of X, then $f_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y)) \in H_*(P, \mathbb{Q})$ has degree less than $r+m-\dim P$. In this case $\langle PD_Q(\kappa), f_*(e(E|_Y, S|_Y))\rangle$ is necessarily zero because $PD_Q(\kappa) \in H^{r+m-\dim P}(Q, \mathbb{R})$. But $\langle PD_P(\kappa), f_*(e(E,S))\rangle$ might be nonzero. So the assumption $Y_0 \subset X_0$ is reasonable and necessary.

Now we shall give a common generalization of Proposition 2.54 and Proposition 3.18.

Let X be a separable PS Banach orbifold satisfying Assumption 4.7, and $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ be the oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundles of index r_i and with compact zero locus $Z(S^{(2)})$, $i = 1, 2$. Assume also that $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ has rich local PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}_i$ and is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Consider the direct sum $E := E^{(1)} \oplus E^{(2)} \to X$, $S := S^{(1)} \oplus S^{(2)} : X \to E$ and $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$. Clearly, $Z(S) = Z(S^{(1)}) \cap Z(S^{(2)})$ and $Z(S) = Z(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})})$. Then (X, E, S) is an oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle with rich local PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$. One also easily shows that (X, E, S) is also (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}$ from the arguments above Proposition 3.18 and ones above Definition 4.3 (by showing that $\mathcal{A}(W) = \mathcal{A}_1(W) \oplus \mathcal{A}_2(W)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(W) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(W) \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2(W)$, which are easily proved).

Proposition 4.12 *(***Stability***). Let* $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$*,* $i = 1, 2$ *be above. Furthermore, assume: (i)* $Z(S^{(1)}) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$ *and* $Z(S^{(2)}) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$*, (ii)* $S^{(2)}$ *is transversal to the zero section at each point* $x \in Z(S)$*, (iii)* $DS^{(2)}|_{Z(S)}$ *is surjective. Then one has:*

- **(a)** *For some small open neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $Z(S)$ *in* X *the intersection* $Z(S^{(2)})^\star := Z(S^{(2)}) \cap \mathcal{U}$ *is a weakly k-PS Banach orbifold of dimension* r_2*. (In particular, the top stratum of* $Z(S^{(2)})^\star$ *is contained in* X_0*.)*
- **(b)** $D(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}) : (TZ(S^{(2)}))|_{Z(S)} \to E^{(1)}|_{Z(S)}$ *is a PS Fredholm bundle map of index* $\mathrm{Ind}(D(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS)$ *(which precisely means*

$$\mathrm{Ind}\big(D(S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})(x)\big) = \mathrm{Ind}(DS(x))\ \forall x \in Z(S)\ ).$$

(c) *If* $(Z(S^{(2)})^\star, E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$ *is (weakly) k-good relative to* $\mathcal{A}_1|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}$ *and some closed neighborhood of* $Z(S)$ *in* $Z(S^{(2)})^\star$ *is flat in* X*, then* $(Z(S^{(2)})^\star, E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$ *and* (X, E, S) *have respectively virtual Euler chains* C_1 *and* C *such that* $C = C_1$*. In particular, if both* $e(E, S)$ *and* $e(E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$ *exist, then* C *and* C_1 *can be chosen as closed weakly k-PS manifolds (thus being cycles). Consequently,*

$$e(E, S) = (i_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})_* e(E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}).$$

Here $(i_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})_*$ *is the homomorphism between homology groups induced by the inclusion* $i_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star} : Z(S^{(2)})^\star \to X$*.*

Proof. The proof may be obtained by almost completely repeating the proof of Proposition 2.54. The main changes are:

- All words “Banach orbifold”, “Banach orbibundle”, ”bundle”, “suborbifold” and “section” *are changed into words* “PS Banach orbifold”, “PS Banach orbibundle”, “PS bundle”, “PS suborbifold” and “PS section”.
- *Delete* “As before we assume ...” from the third line above (2.129) to the end of this paragraph, and **add** “Since the lift PS section $\widetilde{S}_i^{(1)} : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i^{(1)}$ of $S^{(1)}|_{W_i}$ restricts to a lift PS section $\widetilde{S}_i^{(1)z} = \widetilde{S}_i^{(1)}|_{\widetilde{W}_i^z} : \widetilde{W}_i^z \to \widetilde{E}_i^{(1)z}$ of $S^{(1)}|_{W_i^z}$, as in the proof of Proposition 1.13 we can show that on each stratum the vertical differential $D\widetilde{S}_i^{(1)z}(x)$ at each zero point x of $\widetilde{S}_i^{(1)z}$ is Fredholm and has the same index as $D\widetilde{S}_i^{(1)}(x)$. This yields the first conclusion.”
- *Change* “Note that $S^{(2)}$ is transversal to the zero section..... are strongly transversal to the zero section.” in the fourth pargraph of proof of Proposition 2.54 **into**: “Note that $S^{(2)}$ is transversal to the zero section and that $(Z(S^{(2)})^\star, E^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}, S^{(1)}|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star})$ is (weakly) k-good relative to $\mathcal{A}_1|_{Z(S^{(2)})^\star}$. As in the proof of Proposition 4.10, for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ we can construct the PS sections $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)} = \gamma_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}^{(1)} : \widetilde{W}_i \to \widetilde{E}_i^{(1)} \subset \widetilde{E}_i$ and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z} = \gamma_i \cdot \tilde{s}_{ij}^{(1)z} : \widetilde{W}_i^z \to \widetilde{E}_i^{(1)z}$$

such that for sufficiently small $\mathcal{W}^*$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and each $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$ in a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res} \subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ the global PS section of the PS Banach bundle system $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^*, \widehat{V}^*\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})} : \widehat{V}_I^* \to \widehat{F}_I^*,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

and that of $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)z*}, \widehat{V}^{z*}\big)$, $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})(1)z} = \{\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})(1)z}\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})(1)z} : \widehat{V}_I^{z*} \to \widehat{F}_I^{(1)z*},\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \hat{S}_I^{(1)z}(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij} (\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{(1)z})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

are all weakly k-Fredholm PS sections that are transversal to the zero section." **The remnant arguments** are the same as ones in the proof of Proposition 2.54. (Note that in the present case our proof seems to be simper because many technically local arguments are actually absorbed in the good assumption of PS orbibundles.) $\square$

Let $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ be the oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle of index r and with compact zero locus $Z(S^{(i)})$, $i = 1, 2$. Assume also that $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$ has rich local PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}_i$ and is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. As in Section 2.8 or Proposition 3.20 we can similarly define a homotopy between them and get the following result corresponding with Proposition 2.56.

Proposition 4.13 *(***Homotopy***) Let $(X, E^{(i)}, S^{(i)})$, $i = 0, 1$, be as above, and $(X \times [0, 1], E, S)$ be an oriented homotopy (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundle between them which is (weakly) k-good relative to class $\mathcal{A}$. Assume that $\partial X_0 = \emptyset$. Then there exist virtual Euler chains of $(X \times [0, 1], E, S)$, $(X, E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ and $(X, E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ respectively, $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, $e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})^{\mathbf{t}_0}$ and $e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})^{\mathbf{t}_1}$ such that*

$$\partial e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}} = e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})^{\mathbf{t}_0} \cup (-e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})^{\mathbf{t}_1}).$$

In particular $e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)}) = e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ because they exist by Assumption 4.7 and $\partial X_0 = \emptyset$.

As pointed out below Proposition 2.56, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ if the m-boundary $\partial^m X_0 \neq \emptyset$ then we have more general conclusion in the proposition above, i.e., after neglecting the orientation the m-boundary of $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}$,

$$\partial^m e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \partial^{m-1} e(E^{(0)}, S^{(0)})^{\mathbf{t}_0} \cup \partial^{m-1} e(E^{(1)}, S^{(1)})^{\mathbf{t}_1} \cup e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}_m,$$

where $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}_m$ is defined by

$$\text{“}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}}\text{”} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \big\{ \hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(\partial^m X_0 \times (0, 1)) \to X \times [0, 1] \big\}.$$

Finally, we study the functoriality. Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be two oriented (weakly) PS Banach k-Fredholm orbibundles with compact zero loci. Assume that (X, E, S) (resp. (X', E', S')) has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}'$) and is also (weakly) k-good relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}'$). A **morphism** from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S') is a PS Banach orbibundle embedding $(\psi, \Psi) : E \to E'$ with following properties:

(A) $S \circ \psi = \Psi \circ S'$ and $Z(S') = \psi(Z(S))$;

(B) For any $x \in Z(S)$, the differential $d\psi(x) : T_x X \to T_{\psi(x)} X'$ and the above restriction $\Psi_x : E_x \to E'_{f(x)}$ induce isomorphisms

$$d\psi(x) : \mathrm{Ker}(DS(x)) \to \mathrm{Ker}(DS'(\psi(x))) \quad \text{and}$$
$$[\Psi_x] : \mathrm{Coker}(DS(x)) \to \mathrm{Coker}(DS'(\psi(x))),$$

and the resulting isomorphism from $\det(DS)$ to $\det(DS')$ is orientation preserving. (These are all understand on levels of lifts.)

Clearly, (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') have the same index. Moreover, (A) implies that $Z(S') \subset \psi(X)$. Later writing "$(\psi, \Psi)^*\mathcal{A}' \supseteq \mathcal{A}$" will be understood as follows. (By the definition of the morphism we may assume: X is a PS Banach suborbifold of X' , E is a PS suborbibundle of $E'|_X$ and $S = S'|_X$. ψ and Ψ become the natural inclusions.) For a PS orbifold chart $(\widetilde{W}', \Gamma', \pi')$ on X' and $W = W' \cap X$ let $\widetilde{W} \subset \widetilde{W}'$ be a PS submanifold that is stable under Γ and compatible with the inclusion maps, such that the restriction $(\widetilde{W}, \Gamma', \pi) = (\widetilde{W}, \Gamma'|_{\widetilde{W}}, \pi|_{\widetilde{W}})$ is a PS Banach orbifold chart on X with support W. Then "$(\psi, \Psi)^*\mathcal{A}' \supseteq \mathcal{A}$" means that each PS section of the PS bundle $\widetilde{E} \to \widetilde{W}$ of class $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{W})$ can be extended into a PS section of the PS bundle $\widetilde{E}' \to \widetilde{W}'$ of class $\mathcal{A}'(\widetilde{W})$.

The following is corresponding result with Proposition 2.57:

Proposition 4.14 *Let (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') be as above, and (ψ, Ψ) be a morphism from (X, E, S) to (X', E', S') satisfying $(\psi, \Psi)^*\mathcal{A}' \supseteq \mathcal{A}$. Suppose that X and X' satisfy Assumption 4.7 and that some closed neighborhood of $Z(S') = \psi(Z(S))$ in $\psi(X)$ is flat in X'. Then there exist a family of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple (X', E', S'),*

$$e(E', S')^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{``}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat{\pi}'_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')_0 \to X'\}\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res},$$

and that of strongly cobordant virtual Euler chains of the triple (X, E, S),

$$e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \text{``}\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}}\text{''} \frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \to X\}\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res},$$

and a family of PS embeddings $\{\widehat{\psi}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$, $\widehat{\psi}_I : \widehat{W}_I \to \widehat{W}'_I$, which are also compatible with the projections $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ and $\hat{\pi}'^I_J$, such that for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $J \subset I$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{\psi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')^\circ \cap (\hat{\pi}'_I)^{-1}(\psi(X)),\\
&\widehat{\psi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^{sing}) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')^{sing} \cap (\hat{\pi}'_I)^{-1}(\psi(X)),\\
&\widehat{\psi}_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J = \hat{\pi}'^I_J|_{\widehat{\psi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))} \circ \widehat{\psi}_I,\\
&\Big(\hat{\pi}'^I_J\big((\hat{\pi}'^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}'^*_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')\big)\Big) \cap (\hat{\pi}'_J)^{-1}(\psi(X))\\
&= \widehat{\psi}_I\Big(\hat{\pi}^I_J\big((\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\big)\Big),\\
&\Big(\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}'^I_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S')\Big) \cap (\hat{\pi}'_J)^{-1}(\psi(X))\\
&= \widehat{\psi}_I\big(\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \cap \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)\big).
\end{aligned}$$

If $\overline{W}$ and $\overline{W}'$ are the spaces constructed from $\{\widehat{W}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ and $\{\widehat{W}'_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ respectively then $\{\widehat{\psi}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ induce a natural map $\bar{\psi} : \overline{W} \to \overline{W}'$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{\psi}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S')^\circ \cap (\hat{\pi}')^{-1}(\psi(X)),\\
&\bar{\psi} \circ \hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}'|_{\bar{\psi}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)^\circ)} \circ \bar{\psi}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if $Z(S)\cap X_0\ne\emptyset$*,* $Z(S')\cap X_0'\ne\emptyset$ *and* $\psi(X_0)\subset X_0'$*,* $\partial X_0=\partial X_0'=\emptyset$ *and hence* $e(E,S)$ *and* $e(E',S')$ *exist, then* $\langle\psi^*\alpha, e(E,S)\rangle=\langle\alpha, e(E',S')\rangle$ *for any* $\alpha\in H^*(X',X'\setminus\psi(X);\mathbb{R})$*. (In this case we say* $\psi_*e(E,S)$ *to be the intersection of* $e(E',S')$ *with* $\psi(X)$*.)*

Proof. The proof may be obtained by almost completely repeating the proof of Proposition 2.57. The main changes are:

- The terms such as "manifold", "orbifold" and "bundle" are changed into corresponding terms in the PS category.
- Below Claim 2.58, from "For the chosen trivializations...." to the end of the next paragraph ".....are strongly transversal to the zero section for all $I\in\mathcal{N}$." **is changed into**: "Note that $(\psi,\Psi)^*\mathcal{A}'\supseteq\mathcal{A}$. By the explanation above Proposition 4.14, for $\widetilde{W}_i'$ and $\widetilde{W}_i$ as above each PS section of the PS bundle $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$ of class $\mathcal{A}(\widetilde{W}_i)$ can be extended into a PS section of the PS bundle $\widetilde{E}_i'\to\widetilde{W}_i'$ of class $\mathcal{A}'(\widetilde{W}_i')$. Since (X,E,S) has rich PS sections of class $\mathcal{A}$, we may choose PS sections $\tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j=1,\cdots,m_i$ of the PS bundle $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$ such that

$$D\widetilde{S}_i(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i)+\text{span}\{\tilde{s}_{i1}(\tilde{x}),\cdots,\tilde{s}_{im_i}(\tilde{x})\}=(\widetilde{E}_i)_{\tilde{x}}\quad\forall\tilde{x}\in Z(\widetilde{S}_i).$$

(This is always possible by shrinking W_i if necessary.) Let $\tilde{s}_{ij}'$, $j=1,\cdots,m_i$ be the PS sections of $\widetilde{E}_i'\to\widetilde{W}_i'$ of class $\mathcal{A}'(\widetilde{W}_i')$ obtained by extending $\tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j=1,\cdots,m_i$. With the same proof as in Claim 2.58 we get that

$$D\widetilde{S}_i'(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{W}_i')+\text{span}\{\tilde{s}_{i1}'(\tilde{x}),\cdots,\tilde{s}_{im_i}'(\tilde{x})\}=(\widetilde{E}_i')_{\tilde{x}}\quad\forall\tilde{x}\in Z(\widetilde{S}_i')=Z(\widetilde{S}_i).$$

Consider the sections $\sigma_{ij}':=\gamma_i'\cdot\tilde{s}_{ij}'$ of $\widetilde{E}_i'$ with supports in $\widetilde{W}_i'^1$, and $\sigma_{ij}:=\gamma_i'\cdot\tilde{s}_{ij}$ of $\widetilde{E}_i$ with supports in $\widetilde{W}_i^1$, $j=1,\cdots,m_i$. Clearly, $\sigma_{i1}=\sigma_{i1}'|_{\widetilde{W}_i},\cdots,\sigma_{im_i}=\sigma_{im_i}'|_{\widetilde{W}_i}$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Note that $Z(S')\subset X$. We can assume that the above small neighborhood $\mathcal{W}'^*$ of $Z(S')$ in X is contained in $\cup_{i=1}^n U_i'^0$ (and thus $\mathcal{W}^*=\mathcal{W}'^*\cap X\subset\cup_{i=1}^n U_i^0$). Since (X,E,S) (resp. (X',E',S')) is (weakly) k-good relative to class $\mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}'$), as before we can shrink $\mathcal{W}'^*$ and find a small $\varepsilon>0$ such that for each $\mathbf{t}=\{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}$ in a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}\subset B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $m=\sum_{i=1}^n m_i$, the sections

$$\Upsilon_I^{(\mathbf{t})}:\widehat{V}_I^*\to\widehat{F}_I^*,\ \hat{x}_I\mapsto\hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

$$\Upsilon_I'^{(\mathbf{t})}:\widehat{V}_I'^*\to\widehat{F}_I'^*,\ \hat{x}_I\mapsto\hat{S}_I'(\hat{x}_I)+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij}')_I(\hat{x}_I),$$

are all weakly k-Fredholm PS sections that are transversal to the zero section for all $I\in\mathcal{N}$. The remnant arguments are the same as the proof of Proposition 2.57. □

As above Proposition 3.21, a **PS Fredholm map of index** d from PS Banach orbifolds Y to X is a PS map whose restriction to the top stratum (resp. each lower stratum) is a Fredholm map of index d (resp. index less than or equal to d). Finally we give a generalization of Proposition 2.59 and prove it carefully. Still using the notations therein we have:

Proposition 4.15 *Let* X *and* X' *be two separable PS Banach orbifolds satisfying Assumptions 4.1, 4.7, and* $f : X \to X'$ *be a proper Fredholm map of index* d*. Let* (X, E, S) *(resp.* (X', E', S')*) be the (weakly) PS Banach* k*-Fredholm orbibundle of index* r *(resp.* r'*) with compact zero locus. Assume that* $\bar{f} : (X, E, S) \to (X', E', S')$ *is a PS bundle map, i.e., a bundle map* $\bar{f} : E \to E'$ *covering* f *and satisfying* $S' \circ f = \bar{f} \circ S$*, and that each local lifting of* $\bar{f}$ *is a Banach space isomorphism when restricted to each fiber. (That is,* (X, E, S) *is the pull-back of* (X', E', S') *via* f*). Furthermore assume that* f *is a PS submersion,* $Z(S) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$ *and* $f^{-1}(X_0 \cap Z(S)) \cap Y_0 \neq \emptyset$*. (The latter implies* $f(Y_0) \subset X_0$*). Then*
(i) $r = r' + d$ *and* $Z(S') = f^{-1}(Z(S))$ *is compact.*
Moreover, if (X', E', S') *has also rich PS sections of class* $\mathcal{A}'$ *and is (weakly)* k*-good relative to the class* $\mathcal{A}'$*, then*
(ii) (X, E, S) *is weakly* k*-good relative to the class* $\bar{f}^*\mathcal{A}'$*, and there exist a resolution* $\widehat{V}$ *of* X *near* $Z(S)$ *and that* $\widehat{V}'$ *of* X' *near* $Z(S')$*, and a natural map* $\hat{f} : \widehat{V} \to \widehat{V}'$ *induced by* f*, and the virtual Euler chain* $e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ *(resp.* $e(E', S')^{\mathbf{t}}$*), as a PS map from* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) \subset \widehat{V}$ *(resp.* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S') \subset \widehat{V}'$*) to* X *(resp.* X'*) satisfy*

$$f \circ e(E, S)^{\mathbf{t}} = e(E', S')^{\mathbf{t}} \circ \hat{f}. \tag{4.23}$$

In addition, for $i = 0, 1, 2$*, if* f *sends the strata* $(X, E, S)_i$ *of* (X, E, S) *of codimension* i *to those* $(X', E', S')_i$ *of* (X', E', S') *of codimension* i*,* $\hat{f}_I$ *also sends the strata of* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ *of codimension* i *to those of* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')$ *of codimension* i*.*

As conjectured in Remark 2.60 there should exists some kind of $\mathbb{Q}$-valued topological degree $\deg(f)$ of f so that (4.23) gives

$$f_* e(E, S) = \deg(f) e(E', S')$$

in the case that $d = 0$ and both $e(E, S)$ and $e(E', S')$ exist.

Proof of Proposition 4.15. Since each local lifting of f restricts to a Banach space isomorphism on each fiber we have $Z(S') = f^{-1}(Z(S))$. This local lift is also proper because of the properness of f.

Firstly, we prove (i). For $x \in Z(S)$ let $(\widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U, \pi_U)$ be the PS B-orbifold chart centered at x, and $(\widetilde{U}', \Gamma'_{U'}, \pi_{U'})$ be one centered at $f(x)$. As in Section 2.1 assume that $(\tilde{\bar{f}}_U, \tilde{f}_U, \varphi_U) : (\widetilde{E}_U, \widetilde{U}, \Gamma_U) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{U'}, \widetilde{U}', \Gamma'_{U'})$ is a local representation of $\bar{f}$. Let $\widetilde{S}_U : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{E}_U$ and $\widetilde{S}'_{U'} : \widetilde{U}' \to \widetilde{E}'_{U'}$ be the local lifts of S and S' in the above PS Banach charts respectively.

By (2.4), $\tilde{\bar{f}}_U \circ \widetilde{S}_U = \widetilde{S}'_{U'} \circ \tilde{f}_U$. It follows that

$$d\tilde{\bar{f}}_U(\widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{x})) \circ d\widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{x}) = d\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x})) \circ d\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x})$$

for the lifting $\tilde{x}$ of x in $\widetilde{U}$. Note that $\widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{x}) = (\tilde{x}, 0)$ and that $T_{(\tilde{x},0)}\widetilde{E}_U = T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{U} \oplus (\widetilde{E}_U)_{\tilde{x}}$. One easily checks that

$$\begin{aligned}&d\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U(\tilde{x}, 0)(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{U}) = d\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x})(T_{\tilde{x}}\widetilde{U}) \quad \text{and}\\ &d\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U(\tilde{x}, 0)((\widetilde{E}_U)_{\tilde{x}}) = (\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U)_{\tilde{x}}((\widetilde{E}_U)_{\tilde{x}}).\end{aligned}$$

So the vertical differentials $D\widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{x})$ and $D\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}))$ satisfy:

$$(\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U)_{\tilde{x}} \circ D\widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{x}) = D\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x})) \circ d\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{x}). \tag{4.24}$$

This leads to $r = r' + d$. (i) is proved.

Next we prove that (X, E, S) is weakly k-good relative to the class $\bar{f}^*\mathcal{A}'$. For $\tilde{y} \in Z(\widetilde{S}_U)$ denote by $\tilde{y}' = \tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y})$. For PS sections of $\widetilde{E}'_{U'}$, $\sigma'_1, \cdots, \sigma'_k$, we can define PS sections $\sigma_i : \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{E}_U$ by

$$\sigma_i(\tilde{y}) := (\tilde{\tilde{f}})_{\tilde{y}}^{-1}\big(\sigma'_i(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y}))\big) \tag{4.25}$$

because $(\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U)_{\tilde{z}}$ is the Banach space isomorphism for each $\tilde{z}$. Suppose that

$$\mathrm{Im}(D\widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{y})) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_1(\tilde{y}), \cdots, \sigma_k(\tilde{y})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_U)_{\tilde{y}}. \tag{4.26}$$

By (4.24) we can easily get that

$$\mathrm{Im}\big(D\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{y}') \circ d\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y}')\big) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma'_1(\tilde{y}'), \cdots, \sigma'_k(\tilde{y}')\}) = (\widetilde{E}'_U)_{\tilde{y}'}.$$

Note that $\mathrm{Im}\big(D\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{y}') \circ d\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y})\big) \subset \mathrm{Im}\big(D\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{y}')\big)$. We get that

$$\mathrm{Im}\big(D\widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{y}')\big) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma'_1(\tilde{y}'), \cdots, \sigma'_k(\tilde{y}')\}) = (\widetilde{E}'_U)_{\tilde{y}'}. \tag{4.27}$$

Since (X', E', S') is (weakly) k-good relative to the class $\mathcal{A}'$ there exist a small open neighborhood $O(\tilde{y}')$ of $\tilde{y}'$ in $\widetilde{U}'$ and $\eta > 0$ such that the section

$$\begin{aligned}&O(\tilde{y}') \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^k) \to \Pi_1^*(\widetilde{E}'_{U'}|_{O(\tilde{y}')}),\\ &\Phi' : (\tilde{z}'; t_1, \cdots, t_k) \mapsto \widetilde{S}'_{U'}(\tilde{z}') + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma'_i(\tilde{z}'),\end{aligned}$$

is a (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section that is transversal to the zero section. Here $\Pi_1 : O(\tilde{y}') \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^k) \to O(\tilde{y}')$ is the natural projection. As in (4.24), we can derive from (4.25) that for any $\tilde{z} \in \big(\widetilde{S}_U + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma_i\big)^{-1}(0)$,

$$(\tilde{\tilde{f}}_U)_{\tilde{z}} \circ D\big(\widetilde{S}_U + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma_i\big)(\tilde{z}) = D\big(\widetilde{S}'_{U'} + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma'_i\big) \circ d\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{z}).$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3.21, all these imply that the section

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{f}_U^{-1}(O(\tilde{y}')) \times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^k) \to \Pi_1^*(\widetilde{E}_U|_{\tilde{f}_U^{-1}(O(\tilde{y}'))}),\\ &\Phi : (\tilde{z}; t_1, \cdots, t_k) \mapsto \widetilde{S}_U(\tilde{z}) + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma_i(\tilde{z}),\end{aligned}$$

is a weakly PS k-Fredholm section that is transversal to the zero section. Hence this shows that $\widetilde{S}_U$ is weakly k-quasi transversal to the zero section relative to class $\bar{f}^*\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(\widetilde{U}')$.

Note that for any $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\big(\widetilde{S}_U + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma_i\big)^{-1}(0) = \tilde{f}_U^{-1}\Big[\big(\widetilde{S}'_{U'} + \sum_{i=1}^k t_i\sigma'_i\big)^{-1}(0)\Big].$$

One also easily proves that $\widetilde{S}_U$ is locally proper relative to class $\bar{f}^*\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(\widetilde{U}')$ near $Z(\widetilde{S}_U)$. So (X, E, S) is weakly k-good relative to the class $\bar{f}^*\mathcal{A}'$.

Finally we prove (ii). Since $Z(S')$ is compact we can choose finitely many such local representations of $\bar{f}$,

$$(\tilde{\bar{f}}_{U_i}, \tilde{f}_{U_i}, \varphi_{U_i}) : (\widetilde{E}_{U_i}, \widetilde{U}_i, \Gamma_{U_i}) \to (\widetilde{E}'_{U'_i}, \widetilde{U}'_i, \Gamma'_{U'_i}), \tag{4.28}$$

the corresponding open subsets $U'^0_i \subset W'^j_i \subset\subset U'^j_i \subset\subset W'_i \subset\subset U'_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n, j = 1, \cdots, n-1$, and the PS sections

$$\sigma'_{i1}, \cdots, \sigma'_{im_i} : \widetilde{U}'_i \to \widetilde{E}'_{U'_i}$$

with support in $Cl(\widetilde{U}'^0_i)$, such that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} Z(S') \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U'^0_i, \\ \mathrm{Im}(D\widetilde{S}'_{U'_i}(\tilde{y}')) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma'_{i1}(\tilde{y}'), \cdots, \sigma'_{im_i}(\tilde{y}')\}) = (\widetilde{E}'_{U'_i})_{\tilde{y}'} \\ \quad \forall \tilde{y}' \in Cl(\widetilde{U}'_{i0}) \cap Z(\widetilde{S}'_{U'_i}),\ i = 1, \cdots, n. \end{array}\right\} \tag{4.29}$$

For $i = 1, \cdots, n$, set $U^0_i = f^{-1}(U'^0_i)$, $W^j_i = f^{-1}(W'^j_i)$, $U^j_i = f^{-1}(U'^j_i)$, $W_i = f^{-1}(W'_i)$ and $U_i = f^{-1}(U'_i)$, and

$$\sigma_{il}(\tilde{y}) := (\tilde{\bar{f}})^{-1}_{\tilde{y}}\big(\sigma'_{il}(\tilde{f}_U(\tilde{y}))\big),\ l = 1, \cdots, m_i,$$

then $U^0_i \subset W^j_i \subset\subset U^j_i \subset\subset W_i \subset\subset U_i$, $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$, each σ_{il} has support in $Cl(\widetilde{U}^0_i)$, and it also holds that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} Z(S) \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U^0_i, \\ \mathrm{Im}(D\widetilde{S}_{U_i}(\tilde{y})) + \mathrm{span}(\{\sigma_{i1}(\tilde{y}), \cdots, \sigma_{im_i}(\tilde{y})\}) = (\widetilde{E}_{U_i})_{\tilde{y}} \\ \quad \forall \tilde{y} \in Cl(\widetilde{U}_{i0}) \cap Z(\widetilde{S}_{U_i}),\ i = 1, \cdots, n. \end{array}\right\} \tag{4.30}$$

Let $m = m_1 + \cdots + m_n$. As in (4.5) and (4.6) we have the PS Banach bundle systems

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{V} \times \mathbb{R}^m\big) \\ &= \big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I, \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbb{R}^m), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I, \Gamma_I \ \big|\ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}, \\ &\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}', \widehat{V}' \times \mathbb{R}^m\big) \\ &= \big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}'_I, \widehat{V}'_I \times \mathbb{R}^m), \hat{\pi}'_I, \hat{\pi}'^I_J, \hat{\Pi}'_I, \hat{\Pi}'^I_J, \hat{p}'_I, \Gamma'_I \ \big|\ J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\} \end{aligned}$$

and their global PS sections $\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ and $\Upsilon' = \{\Upsilon'_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Upsilon_I : \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}_I, \\
&\qquad \Big(\hat{x}_I, \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\Big) \mapsto \hat{S}_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I), \\
&\Upsilon'_I : \widehat{V}'_I \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{F}'_I, \\
&\qquad \Big(\hat{x}_I, \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}}\Big) \mapsto \hat{S}'_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} t_{ij}(\hat{\sigma}'_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)
\end{aligned}$$

So each $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ gives a global PS section $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ (resp. $\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$) of the PS Banach bundle systems $(\widehat{V}, \widehat{F})$ (resp. $(\widehat{V}', \widehat{F}')$), where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I : \widehat{V}_I \to \widehat{F}_I,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \Upsilon_I(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \quad \text{and} \\
&\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I : \widehat{V}'_I \to \widehat{F}'_I,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \Upsilon'_I(\hat{x}'_I, \mathbf{t}).
\end{aligned}$$

Carefully applying the resolution arguments in Section 2.3, one can prove that for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$, (4.28) induces a natural group homomorphism $\varphi_I : \Gamma_I \to \Gamma'_I$, a φ_I-equivariant PS map $\hat{f}_I : \widehat{V}_I \to \widehat{V}'_I$ and a φ_I-equivariant PS bundle map $\hat{\hat{f}}_I : \widehat{F}_I \to \widehat{F}'_I$ covering $\hat{f}_I$ such that for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ it holds that

$$\hat{\pi}'^I_J \circ \hat{f}_I = \hat{f}'_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J \ (\text{resp. } \hat{\Pi}'^I_J \circ \hat{\hat{f}}_I = \hat{\hat{f}}'_J \circ \hat{\Pi}^I_J) \tag{4.31}$$

on $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\hat{V}_J)$ (resp. $(\hat{\Pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\hat{F}_J)$). So they give a PS map

$$(\hat{f}, \hat{\hat{f}}) = \{(\hat{f}_I, \hat{\hat{f}}_I) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\} : (\widehat{V}, \widehat{F}) \to (\widehat{V}', \widehat{F}').$$

By the assumptions one can check that each $\hat{f}_I$ is a proper PS Fredholm map and sends the strata of $\widehat{V}_I$ of codimension i to those of $\widehat{V}'_I$ of codimension i, $i = 0, 1, 2$. Moreover, each $\hat{\hat{f}}$ restricts to a Banach space isomorphism on each fiber. The sections $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I$ and $\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I$ above satisfy:

$$\hat{\hat{f}}_I \circ \Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I = \Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I \circ \hat{f}_I \tag{4.32}$$

for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$.

Since f is proper for each sufficiently small open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}'^*$ of $Z(S')$ in $\cup_{i=1}^n U'^0_i$ the inverse image $\mathcal{W}^* := f^{-1}(\mathcal{W}'^*)$ is also very small open neighborhood of $Z(S)$ in $\cup_{i=1}^n U^0_i$. Note that (X, E, S) and (X', E', S') are $\bar{f}^*\mathcal{A}$-good and $\mathcal{A}$-good respectively. As before, using (4.29) and (4.30) we have a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and a residual subset $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ in $B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for each $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\}_{\substack{1\le j\le m_i\\ 1\le i\le n}} \in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ both sections

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I : \widehat{V}^*_I \to \widehat{F}^*_I,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \Upsilon_I(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t})$$

and

$$\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I : \widehat{V}'^*_I \to \widehat{F}'^*_I,\ \hat{x}_I \mapsto \Upsilon'_I(\hat{x}'_I, \mathbf{t})$$

are (weakly) k-Fredholm PS section and also transversal to the zero section. Here

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{V}'^*_I = (\hat{\pi}'_I)^{-1}(W'^* \cap V'_I), \quad \widehat{F}'^*_I = \widehat{F}'_I|_{\widehat{V}'^*_I},\\ &\widehat{V}^*_I = (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(W^* \cap V_I) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{F}^*_I = \widehat{F}_I|_{\widehat{V}^*_I}.\end{aligned}$$

As before we set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) = (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S') = (\Upsilon'^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0).$$

Then (4.32) implies that for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\hat{f}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S') \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\pi}'^I_J \circ \hat{f}_I = \hat{f}_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J. \tag{4.33}$$

Since $f(Y_0) \subset X_0$, it easily follows that the following commutative diagram holds:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 \arrow[r, "\hat{f}"] \arrow[d, "\hat{\pi}"'] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S')_0 \arrow[d, "\hat{\pi}'"'] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"] & X'
\end{tikzcd}$$

which is, by (4.16), is equivalent to (4.23). (That is, $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, as a PS map from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0 \subset \widehat{V}$ to X, and $e(E',S')^{\mathbf{t}}$, as a PS map from $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S')_0 \subset \widehat{V}'$ to X', satisfy (4.23).) Here we also use $\hat{f}$ to denote the induced natural map from $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_0$ to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S')_0$.

Under the final assumption, it is easily seen that $\hat{f}_I$ also sends the strata of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ of codimension i to those of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S')$ of codimension i, $i = 0, 1, 2$. $\square$

4.3 Framework II

In the studies of the Floer homology and the (open string) Gromov-Witten invariants one needs to consider the oriented (weakly) PS Banach 0-Fredholm orbibundles with the strata of codimension 1. (Actually, the bundle should also be smoothly (weakly) 0-good.) By Definition 3.7 there is a stratum of X, denoted by X_1, such that $(X,E,S)_1 = (X_1, E|_{X_1}, S|_{X_1})$ is a Banach Fredholm bundle of index $\mathrm{Ind}(S) - 1$. As before let $(X,E,S)_0 = (X_0, E|_{X_0}, S|_{X_0})$ denote the top stratum of (X,E,S), i.e. the stratum of codimension 0. Denote by $X_{01} = X_0 \cup X_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_i = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(X_i),\ i = 0, 1,\\ &\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01} = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S) \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(X_{01}).\end{aligned}$$

Then by (4.10) it holds that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\hat\pi^I_J\big((\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_i\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)_i,\\ \hat\pi^I_J\big((\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\partial^k\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_i\big)=\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\cap\partial^k\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)_i\end{array}\right\}\qquad(4.34)$$

for any $i=0,1$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$. In general, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ is a weakly 0-PS manifold of dimension r. Since the closure of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ in $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)$ is compact, the topological boundary of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ in $\widehat{V}^*_I$

$$\partial_t\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}\subseteq\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge2},\qquad(4.35)$$

where $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0\cap(\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(\partial X_0)$ and ∂X_0 is the boundary Banach orbifold of X_0, and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge2}$ is the union of all strata of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ of codimension more than 1. We first prove:

Lemma 4.16 *If $r=1$ and $\mathbf{t}\in B_\delta(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ then all sets $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1$ and $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0$ are finite.*

Proof. Firstly, $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1)$ is a closed subset in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$. In fact, let $\hat\pi_I(\hat x_{Ik})\to x$ for some sequence $\{\hat x_{Ik}\}\subset\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1)$. Since the set $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ is compact by Proposition 4.6(iv), so is $Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1)$. It follows that $\hat\pi_I^{-1}\big(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1)\big)$ is compact in $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)$. By Remark 2.34, after passing a subsequence (if necessary), we may assume $\hat x_{Ik}\to\hat x_I\in\hat\pi_I^{-1}(x)\subset Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)\subset\widehat{V}^+_I$. This $\hat x_I$ must belong to $\widehat{V}^+_I\cap\hat\pi_I^{-1}(X_1)$ since $r=1$ and thus $X=X_0\cup X_1$. Moreover, the compactness of $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ implies $x\in\hat\pi_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S))$ for some $L\in\mathcal{N}$, where $L\subset I$ or $I\subset L$. Let $x=\hat\pi_L(\hat x_L)$ for some $\hat x_L\in\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S)$. As at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 2.38, $\Upsilon=\{\Upsilon_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ can naturally extend to a (weakly) PS 0-Fredholm section of $(\mathbf{P}^*_1\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^+,\widehat{V}^+\times\mathbb{R}^m)$, denoted by $\Upsilon_+=\{\Upsilon_{+I}\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$. Let $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_{+I}$ be the corresponding (weakly) PS 0-Fredholm section with $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I$ in Corollary 4.5. Then each $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_{+I}$ restricts to $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_I$ on $\widehat{V}^*_I$. By the compatibility of the family $\{(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_{+I})^{-1}(0)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$, we have $\hat x_I\in(\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{t})}_{+I})^{-1}(0)_1$ and thus $\hat x_L\in\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S)_1$ and $x\in\hat\pi_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_L(S)_1)$. The claim is proved.

Next, the compactness of $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ implies that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1)$ is compact. The desired conclusion easily follows from the fact that each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1$ is a manifold of dimension zero.

Similarly, we can prove that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0)$ is a closed subset in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$. Thus it is compact and hence a finite set. □

In contrast with Assumption 4.7 in Framework I, **from now on** we make:

Assumption 4.17 The union X_{01} of X_0 and X_1 is contained in the regular part X° of X.

In contrast to (4.14), for any $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$ we formally write

$$e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}:=\text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\big\{\hat\pi_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}\to X\big\}\qquad(4.36)$$

where "$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$" is understand as in (2.111). It is a rational singular chain in X of dimension $r=\mathrm{Ind}(S)$, called a **virtual Euler chain** of the triple (X,E,S).

As in Remark 2.43(iii) let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation in the disjoint union $\coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ generated by setting $\hat y_I\sim\hat z_J$ if $J\subset I$ and $\hat\pi^I_J(\tilde y_I)=\hat z_J$. Denote by

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_{01}:=\coprod_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}/\sim \tag{4.37}$$

and by $\hat q_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_{01}$ the restriction of the obvious quotient map to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$. Since $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}\subset\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)^\circ$ we have a well-defined label function

$$\lambda:\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_{01}\to\mathbb{Q},\ \bar x\mapsto\frac{|\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|}{|\Gamma_I|}\quad\text{if }\bar x\in\mathrm{Im}(\hat q_I), \tag{4.38}$$

where $|\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)|$ is the number of elements in the set $\hat q_I^{-1}(\bar x)$.

We hope that $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ is a smooth manifold with boundary $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1$. In the case that the bundle (X,E,S) is also smoothly (weakly) 0-good, the final claim in Corollary 4.5 tells us that each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is a smooth manifold of dimension r and with corner, and each stratum $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_i$ is a submanifold.

Proposition 4.18 *Under Assumption 4.17, if the bundle (X,E,S) is also smoothly (weakly) 0-good, then each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ is a r-dimensional oriented manifold with boundary $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1$, i.e.*

$$\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}=\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1. \tag{4.39}$$

In particular, if X_0 has no boundary as a Banach orbifold, then $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1$ because $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0=\emptyset$.

Proof. By (4.35), $\partial_t\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}\subseteq\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge2}$. In the present case we conclude

$$\partial_t\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}=\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge2}. \tag{4.40}$$

In fact, for any $x\in\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge2}$, if there exists a small open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}(x)$ of x in $\widehat{V}^*_I$ such that $\mathcal{U}(x)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0=\emptyset$, then the intersection $\mathcal{U}(x)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)=\mathcal{U}(x)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge1}$ is a weakly PS manifold of dimension less than r and with finitely many strata. This contradicts to the fact that $\mathcal{U}(x)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is a nonempty open subset of the r-dimensional manifold $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$. Hence $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1\cup\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{\ge2}\subseteq\partial_t\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ and thus (4.40) holds true.

Recall that a boundary manifold (or manifold boundary) of the manifold $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ is a submanifold of codimension one on which each point is a topological boundary point. Hence (4.39) follows immediately. $\square$

Under the assumption of Proposition 4.18, the boundary of $e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ is defined as

$$\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}:=\text{``}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{''}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\big\{\hat\pi_I:\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}\to X\big\}. \tag{4.41}$$

Corresponding with Claim 4.8 we still have:

Claim 4.19 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.18, then* $\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$ *is a rational singular cycle in* X *and its homology class* $[\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}] \in H_{r-1}(X,\mathbb{Q})$ *is zero.*

If $r=1$, by Proposition 4.18 each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_{01}$ is a 1-dimensional oriented manifold with boundary $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_0 \cup \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)_1$. By the classification theorem of the 1-dimensional manifold each connected component of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ is diffeomorphic to either the circle S^1 or one of three intervals $[0,1]$, $[0,1)$ and $(0,1)$. For each $\hat{x}_I \in \partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$, as usual the orientation of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$ induces an one of $\hat{x}_I$, i.e., a number $o(\hat{x}_I)\in\{1,-1\}$. More precisely, since there must exist an embedding $\varphi:(0,1)\to \mathrm{Int}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S))$ such that $\varphi(1/n)\to\hat{x}_I$ as $n\to\infty$, $o(\hat{x}_I)$ is defined as 1 (resp. -1) if φ is orientation preserving (resp. reversing). From this definition and (4.34) it immediately follows that

$$o(\hat{\pi}^I_J(\hat{x}_I)) = o(\hat{x}_I) \tag{4.42}$$

for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$ and $\hat{x}_I\in(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)$. Moreover, under Assumption 4.17, if $r=1$ then for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$ the projection

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)\to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)$$

is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold (regular) PS covering. So using (4.34) and (4.42) we can derive that for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$,

$$\sum_{\hat{x}\in(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}o(\hat{x}) = \sum_{\hat{y}\in\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_J|}o(\hat{y}). \tag{4.43}$$

We call the rational number

$$\sharp\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} := \text{“}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\text{”}\sum_{\hat{x}\in\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}o(\hat{x}) \tag{4.44}$$

the **oriented number** of $\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}$, where as before “$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$” means that for the parts

$$\sum_{\hat{x}\in(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}^*_J)\cap\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}o(\hat{x})\quad\text{in}\quad\sum_{\tilde{x}\in\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}o(\hat{x})$$

and

$$\sum_{\hat{y}\in\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J)\cap\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_J|}o(\hat{y})\quad\text{in}\quad\sum_{\tilde{y}\in\partial\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(S)}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_J|}o(\tilde{y})$$

we only count them once because they are same by (4.43).

By (4.42), for $\bar{x}\in\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)=\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)_{01}$ we can define

$$o(\bar{x}) := o(\hat{x}) \tag{4.45}$$

with any representative of the equivalence class $\bar{x}$, and then using the label function λ in (4.41) define the **oriented number** of $\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)$ by

$$\sharp\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S) := \sum_{\bar{x}\in\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S)} \lambda(\bar{x})o(\bar{x}). \tag{4.46}$$

One easily proves that

$$\sharp\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}} = \sharp\partial\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(S). \tag{4.47}$$

It follows from Claim 4.19 that

Theorem 4.20 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.18, if* $r=1$ *then the oriented number* $\sharp\partial e(E,S)^{\mathbf{t}}=0$ *for any* $\mathbf{t}\in B_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^m)_{res}$.

In the Floer homology, though the case $r=0$ is sufficient for defining the boundary map, the case that $r=1$ and X_0 has no boundary as a Banach orbifold will be used when one proves the boundary map to be indeed a boundary operator. The case that $r=1$ and X_0 has a boundary is also needed for one proving the associated chain homomorphisms with different Hamiltonian homotopies are chain homotopy equivalent.

Finally, after replaceing Assumption 4.7 by Assumption 4.17 (if necessary) in Prop.4.10 (the restriction principle), Prop.4.12 (stability), Prop.4.13 (homotopy), Prop.4.14 and Prop.4.15 (functoriality) all corresponding conclusions about the virtual Euler chains still hold.

The deep studies of different product operators in Floer theory require us to consider the case $r>1$. For a smoothly (weakly) 0-good PS Banach 0-Fredholm orbibundle, our theory and techniques can easily be further developed to satisfy different needs. We here do not present them.

A Appendix: Banach manifolds with corners

For convenience of the readers we review some basic materials on the Banach manifolds, cf. [MaOu]. Let $B_1,\cdots,B_n$ be real Banach spaces. For $(x_1,\cdots,x_n)\in B_1\times\cdots\times B_n$,

$$\|(x_1,\cdots,x_n)\| = \max\{\|x_1\|,\cdots,\|x_n\|\},$$

define one of three typical equivalent norms on the real linear space $B_1\times\cdots\times B_n$. Their topology is the product topology of the spaces $B_1,\cdots,B_n$. For a real Banach space B denote by $\mathcal{L}(B,\mathbb{R})$ the space of all continuous real linear functionals on B. Let $\Lambda=\{\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_n\}$ be a linearly independent system of elements of $\mathcal{L}(B,\mathbb{R})$. The set

$$B^+_\Lambda := \{x\in B\,|\,\lambda_1(x)\ge 0,\cdots,\lambda_n(x)\ge 0\}$$

is called the **Λ-quadrant of order** n of B. If $\Lambda=\{\lambda\}$ we also denote B^+_Λ by B^+_λ. Then it is clear that $B^+_\Lambda=\cap^n_{i=1}E^+_{\lambda_i}$ and $B^+_\Lambda=B$ if $\Lambda=\emptyset$. We also denote $\cap^n_{i=1}\mathrm{Ker}(\lambda_i)$ by B^0_Λ or B^0_λ if $\Lambda=\{\lambda\}$. Then we have $B^0_\Lambda=\cap^n_{i=1}B^0_{\lambda_i}$ and $B^0_\Lambda=B$ if $\Lambda=\emptyset$.

Definition A.1 Let B and F be two real Banach spaces, B_Λ^+ a Λ-quadrant of B and U an open set of B_Λ^+. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that a map $f : U \to F$ is of class p on U if f is p times differentiable on U and the map $D^p f : U \to \mathcal{L}_s^p(B, F)$ is continuous. If f is of class p on U for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that f is of class ∞ on U.

Proposition A.2 *Let $f : U \to F$ be as in Definition A.1, and $p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$.*

(i) If the real Banach space B admits differentiable partitions of unity of class p, then f is of class p on U if and only if for any $x \in U$ there exist an open neighborhood $V(x)$ of x in B and a map $f_x : V(x) \to F$ of class p (in the sense of the ordinary Differential Calculus) such that f_x and f coincide on $V(x) \cap U$.

(ii) If $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then f is of class p on U if and only if there exist an open set G of B and a map $\bar{f} : G \to F$ of class p (in the sense of the ordinary Differential Calculus) such that $G \cap B_\Lambda^+ = U$ and $f = \bar{f}$ on U.

Let X be a Hausdorff topological space. A **Banach chart** on X is a 4-tuple (U, φ, B, Λ) consisting of an open subset U of X, a real Banach space B, a linearly independent system Λ of elements of $\mathcal{L}(B, \mathbb{R})$ and a homeomorphism φ from U to an open subset $\varphi(U)$ of B_Λ^+. The space B is called the **model** of the chart, and U the **domain** of the chart. Two Banach charts (U, φ, B, Λ) and $(U', \varphi', B', \Lambda')$ on X are said to be **compatible** of class p if $\varphi(U \cap U')$ and $\varphi'(U \cap U')$ are open subsets in B_Λ^+ and $B'^+_{\Lambda'}$ respectively, and

$$\varphi' \circ \varphi^{-1} : \varphi(U \cap U') \to \varphi'(U \cap U') \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \circ \varphi'^{-1} : \varphi'(U \cap U') \to \varphi(U \cap U')$$

are of class p (and hence C^p-diffeomorphisms).

Definition A.3 A collection $\mathcal{A}$ of charts on a Hausdorff space X is called an **atlas** of class p on X if the domains of the charts of $\mathcal{A}$ cover X and any two of them are compatible of class p. Such two atlases $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ on X is said to be **equivalent** of class p if $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$ is also an atlas of class p on X. It may be proved that this is indeed a equivalence relation over the atlases of class p on X for each $p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Denote by $[\mathcal{A}]$ the equivalent class of the atlas of class p on X. It is called **differentiable structure** of class p on X and the pair $(X, [\mathcal{A}])$ is called C^p-Banach manifold, usually only denoted by X.

It should be remarked that for two charts (U, φ, B, Λ) and $(U', \varphi', B', \Lambda')$ of a Banach manifold X at x the Banach spaces B and B' are not linearly homeomorphic.

Definition A.4 Let B_Λ^+ be a Λ-quadrant of order n in the real Banach space B as above, and U an open set of B_Λ^+. For $x \in B_\Lambda^+$, $\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(x) := \sharp(\{i \,|\, \lambda_i(x) = 0\}$ is called Λ**-index** of x. The sets $\partial_\Lambda U := \{x \in U \,|\, \mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(x) \geq 1\}$ and $\mathrm{int}_\Lambda U := \{x \in U \,|\, \mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(x) = 0\}$ are called Λ-**boundary** of U and Λ-**interior** of U, respectively.

Proposition A.5 *Let B_Λ^+ be a Λ-quadrant of order n in the real Banach space B as above, and U an open set of B_Λ^+. Then we have:*

(i) $U - \partial_\Lambda U = \mathrm{int}_\Lambda U = U \cap \mathrm{int}_\Lambda B_\Lambda^+$*;*

(ii) $U = (\partial_\Lambda U) \cup \mathrm{int}_\Lambda U$ *and* $(\partial_\Lambda U) \cap \mathrm{int}_\Lambda U \neq \emptyset$*;*

(iii) *If* $\Lambda = \emptyset$ *then* $\partial_\Lambda U = \emptyset$ *and* $\mathrm{int}_\Lambda U = U$*;*

(iv) $\mathrm{int}_\Lambda U$ *is the topological interior of* U *in* B*.*

(v) *If* $\partial_\Lambda U \neq \emptyset$ *then* $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$ *and* $\mathrm{int}_\Lambda U \neq \emptyset$.

Moreover, if F_γ^+ is a Γ-quadrant of order m in another Banach space F, V an open set of F_γ^+ and $f : U \to V$ a diffeomorphism of class $p \geq 1$, then

(vi) $\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(x) = \mathrm{ind}_\Gamma(f(x))$ *for all* $x \in U$*;*

(vii) $\partial_\Lambda U \neq \emptyset$ *if and only if* $\partial_\Gamma V \neq \emptyset$*;*

(viii) $f(\mathrm{int}_\Lambda U) = \mathrm{int}_\Gamma V$ *and* $f(\partial_\Lambda U) = \partial_\gamma v$*;*

(ix) $f|_{\mathrm{int}_\Lambda U} : \mathrm{int}_\Lambda U \to \mathrm{int}_\Gamma V$ *is a diffeomorphism of class* p*.*

It follows that for any Banach manifold X of class $p \geq 1$, if $x \in X$ is contained in the domains of two Banach charts (U, φ, B, Λ) and $(U', \varphi', B', \Lambda')$ of X one has $\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(\varphi(x)) = \mathrm{ind}_{\Lambda'}(\varphi'(x))$. Thus we may define $\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(\varphi(x))$ to be **index** of x, denoted by $\mathrm{ind}(x)$, where (U, φ, B, Λ) is any Banach chart of X whose domain contains x. One can prove that for any $x \in X$ there exists a Banach chart (U, φ, B, Λ) of X such that $x \in U$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$. Such a chart is called **centered chart** at x.

Definition A.6 Let X be a Banach manifold of class $p \geq 1$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we define

$$\partial^k X := \{x \in X \,|\, \mathrm{ind}(x) \geq k\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_k X = \{x \in X \,|\, \mathrm{ind}(x) = k\}.$$

The former is called k-**boundary** of X. In particular $\partial^1 X$ is called **boundary** of X and denoted by ∂X. Clearly, $\partial^0 X = X$. $B_0 X$ is called **interior** of X and denoted by $\mathrm{Int}(X)$.

Proposition A.7 *Let X be a Banach manifold of class $p \geq 1$. Then we have:*

(a) $\mathrm{Int}(X)$ *is a dense open set of* X*.*

(b) $\partial^k X$ *is a closed set of* X *for any* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*.*

(c) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ there exists a unique differentiable structure of class p on $B_k X$ such that for all $x \in B_k X$ and all charts (U, φ, B, Λ) of X centered at x, the triplet $(U \cap B_k X, \varphi|_{U \cap B_k X}, B_\Lambda^0)$ is a Banach chart of that structure. Furthermore B_k has no boundary, i.e. $\partial(B_k X) = \emptyset$, and the topology of the manifold $B_k X$ is the topology induced by X.*

(d) *There is a unique differentiable structure of class p on* $\mathrm{Int}(X)$ *such that for all $x \in$* $\mathrm{Int}(X)$ *and all charts (U, φ, B, Λ) of X centered at x (hence $\Lambda = \emptyset$, $U \subset$* $\mathrm{Int}(X)$ *and $B_\Lambda^0 = B$) the triplet (U, φ, B) is a chart of* $\mathrm{Int}(X)$*. Furthermore* $\mathrm{Int}(X)$ *has no boundary and its topology is the topology induced by X.*

(e) *If $\partial^2 X = \emptyset$, there is a unique differentiable structure of class p on ∂X such that for all $x \in \partial X$ and all charts (U, φ, B, Λ) of X centered at x (hence $\Lambda = \{\lambda\}$), it happens that $(U \cap \partial X, \varphi|_{U \cap \partial X}, B^0_\lambda)$ is a chart of ∂X. Furthermore ∂X has boundary and its topology is the topology induced by X.*

Proposition A.8 *Let X and X' be two Banach manifolds of class $p \geq 1$, and $f : X \to X'$ a diffeomorphism of class p. Then we have:*

(1) $\operatorname{ind}(x) = \operatorname{ind}(f(x))$ *for all* $x \in X$*;*

(2) $f(\partial^k X) = \partial^k X'$ *and* $f(B_k X) = B_k X'$ *for all* $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap \{0\}$*;*

(3) *For all $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap \{0\}$, $f|_{B_k X} : B_k X \to B_k X'$ is a diffeomorphism of class p, where $B_k X$ and $B_k X'$ are the manifolds described in Proposition A.7(c). In particular, if $\partial^2 X = \emptyset$, f is a diffeomorphism of class p of $\partial X = B_1 X$ onto $\partial X' = B_1 X'$.*

Proposition A.9 *Let X and Y be two Banach manifolds of class p. Then there is a unique structure of differentiable manifold of class p, $[\mathcal{A}]$, in $X \times Y$ such that for every chart (U, φ, B, Λ) of X and every chart (V, ψ, F, Γ), $(U \times V, \varphi \times \psi, B \times F, \Lambda \circ p_1 \cup \Gamma \circ p_2))$ is a chart of $(X \times Y, [\mathcal{A}])$. The pair $(X \times Y, [\mathcal{A}])$ is called the* **product manifold** *of X and Y. Then we have:*

(1) *The topology of the product manifold $X \times Y$ is the product of the topologies of X and Y;*

(2) *For every* $(x, y) \in X \times Y$, $\operatorname{ind}(x, y) = \operatorname{ind}(x) + \operatorname{ind}(y)$*;*

(3) $\partial(X \times Y) = (\partial x \times Y) \cup (X \times \partial Y)$*, more generally, for all* $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap \{0\}$,

$$\partial^k(X \times Y) = \bigcup_{\substack{i+j=k \\ i \geq 0, j \geq 0}} (\partial^i x \times \partial^j Y);$$

(4) $\operatorname{Int}(X \times Y) = \operatorname{Int}(X) \times \operatorname{Int}(Y)$*, more generally, for all* $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap \{0\}$,

$$B_k(X \times Y) = \bigcup_{\substack{i+j=k \\ i \geq 0, j \geq 0}} (B_i x \times B_j Y);$$

and these $B_i X \times B_j Y$ are pairwise disjoint open sets of $B_k(X \times Y)$.

Theorem A.10 *(***Local Inverse Mapping Theorem for Open Sets with Corners***). Let U be an open subset of a quadrant B^+_Λ, F^+_Γ a quadrant of a Banach space F, $f : U \to F^+_\Gamma$ a map of class p ($p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$) such that $f(\partial_\Lambda(U)) \subset \partial F^+_\Gamma$. For $x \in U$, suppose that $DF(x) : B \to F$ is a linear homeomorphism. Then there exist an open neighbourhood $U_1(x)$ of x in U and an open neighborhood U' of $f(x)$ in F^+_Γ such that $f|_{U_1(x)}$ is a diffeomorphism of class p from $U_1(x)$ onto U'.*

Theorem A.11 *(***The Implicit Function Theorem for Manifolds with Corners***). Let X, Y, Z be differentiable manifolds of class p ($p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$), $f : X \times Y \to Z$ a map of class p and $(a, b) \in X \times Y$. Suppose that*

$D_2f(a,b) : T_bY \to T_{f(a,b)}Z$ is a linear homeomorphism and suppose that there are an open neighborhood $V(a)$ of a and an open neighborhood $V(b)$ of b such that $f(V(a) \times (V(b) \cap \partial y)) \subset \partial Z$.

Then there are an open neighborhood $W(a)$ of a, an open neighborhood $W(b)$ of b and a unique map $g : W(a) \to W(b)$ such that:

(1) *$f(x, g(x)) = f(a, b)$ for $x \in W(a)$;*

(2) *$g(a) = b$ and g is of class p on $W(a)$;*

(3) *For every $x \in W(a)$, $D_2f(x, g(x))$ is a linear homeomorphism from $T_xW(a) = T_xX$ to $T_{g(x)}W(b) = T_{g(x)}Y$, and $Dg(x) = -(D_2f(x, g(x)))^{-1} \circ D_1f(x, g(x))$.*

Proposition A.12 *(***Topological properties of the differential manifolds***). Let X be a Banach manifold. Then*

(1) *X is locally connected and locally path-connected;*

(2) *X satisfies the first axiom of countability;*

(3) *X satisfies the second axiom of countability if and only if one of the following two conditions hold:*

  (3.1) *X satisfies the Lindelöf property and has an atlas whose charts are modelled over separable real Banach spaces;*

  (3.2) *X has a countable atlas whose charts are modelled over separable real Banach spaces;*

(4) *X is locally compact if and only if it is locally of finite dimension;*

(5) *X is a Baire space;*

(6) *X is a metrizable space if and only if X is a paracompact space.*

Let X and Y be C^p Banach manifolds with $p \geq 1$. A C^1-map $f : X \to Y$ is called **Fredholm** at $x \in X$ if $df(x) : T_xX \to T_{f(x)}Y$ is a Fredholm operator. In this case the Fredholm index of f at x, $\mathrm{ind}_x(f)$, is defined as the Fredholm index of $df(x)$. f is said to be a Fredholm map if it is Fredholm at each point of X. A point $x \in X$ is called **singular** if $df(x)$ is not surjective. The set of singular points of f is denoted by $S(f)$. Each point in $X \setminus S(f)$ is called a **regular point** of f. A point in $Y \setminus f(S(f))$ is called a **regular value** of f.

Theorem A.13 *(***Smale and Quinn Density Theorem***). Let X and Y be C^p Banach manifolds. For a C^p Fredholm map $f : X \to Y$ such that $p \geq 1 + \mathrm{ind}_x(f)$ for every $x \in X$ one has:*
*(***Smale***) If X and Y are T_3 topological spaces and X is Lindelöf then $Y \setminus f(S(f))$ is a residual set in Y and therefore it is dense in Y.*
*(***Quinn***) If X is a T_3 space and f is also σ-proper then $Y \setminus f(S(f))$ is a residual set in Y and therefore it is dense in Y. Moreover, if f is proper then $Y \setminus f(S(f))$ is open and dense in Y.*

Proposition A.14 *Let X and Y be separable Banach manifolds, and Z be a Banach space. Suppose that $\Phi : X \times Y \to Z$ is transversal to a point $q \in Z$. Then $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q) := \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \,|\, \Phi(x, y) = q\}$ is a separable Banach manifold and $y \in Y$ is a regular value of the restriction of the projection $\mathbf{P}_Y$ (to the second factor Y) to $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q)$ if and only if the map*

$$\Phi_y : X \to Z,\ x \mapsto \Phi(x, y)$$

is transversal to q. In particular, if Φ is equal to $f \oplus g : X \times Y \to Z$, $(x, y) \mapsto f(x) + g(y)$, where $f : X \to Z$ is a C^l Fredholm map of and $g : Y \to Z$ a C^l-smooth map, then the restriction of the projection $\mathbf{P}_Y$ to $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q)$ is a Fredholm map of index $\operatorname{Ind}(f)$.

Proof. The first conclusion is standard. To arrive at the second note that $y \notin \mathbf{P}_Y(\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q))$ if and only if $\Phi(x, y) \neq q$ for any $x \in X$. When $y \in \mathbf{P}_Y(\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q))$ and $x \in (\Phi_y)^{-1}(q)$, i.e. $\Phi(x, y) = q$, the differential

$$d\Big(\mathbf{P}_Y\Big|_{\mathcal{M}(\Phi,q)}\Big)(x, y) : T_{(x,y)}\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q) \to T_yY,\ (\xi, \eta) \mapsto \eta$$

is surjective if and only if for each $\eta \in T_yY$ there exists $\xi \in T_xX$ such that $(\xi, \eta) \in \operatorname{Ker}(\Phi(x, y))$, i.e. $d_x\Phi(x, y)(\xi) + d_y\Phi(x, y)(\eta) = d\Phi_y(x)(\xi) + d_y\Phi(x, y)(\eta) = 0$. If Φ_y is transversal to q at this x, then $d\Phi_y(x) : T_xX \to$ is onto, and thus for any $\eta \in T_yY$ one has $\xi \in T_xX$ satisfying $d\Phi_y(x)(\xi) = -d_y\Phi(x, y)(\eta)$. Conversely, for any $z \in Z$, since $d\Phi(x, y)$ is surjective we have $(\zeta_1, \eta) \in T_xX \times T_yY$ such that $d_x\Phi(x, y)(\zeta_1) + d_y\Phi(x, y)(\eta) = z$. Moreover, $d\Big(\mathbf{P}_Y\Big|_{\mathcal{M}(\Phi,q)}\Big)(x, y)$ is surjective one has also $\zeta_2 \in T_xX$ such that $(\zeta_2, -\eta) \in T_{(x,y)}\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q)$, i.e $d_x\Phi(x, y)(\zeta_2) + d_y\Phi(x, y)(-\eta) = 0$. It follows that $d_x\Phi(x, y)(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) = z$. That is, $d_x\Phi_y(x)$ is surjective.

Finally, if $\Phi = f \oplus g$, then at any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi, q)$ the tangent space $T_{(x,y)}\mathcal{M}(\Phi, q) = \operatorname{Ker}(\Phi(x, y)) = \{(\xi, \eta) \in T_xX \times T_yY \,|\, df(x)(\xi) + dg(y)(\eta) = 0\}$. Since the differential

$$d\Phi(x, y) : T_{(x,y)}(X \times Y) \to T_qZ = Z, (\xi, \eta) \mapsto df(x)(\xi) + dg(y)(\eta)$$

is onto, and $df(x)$ is Fredholm, by Lemma 1.3(i) the projection $P_2 : T_xX \times T_yY \to T_xY$ to $\operatorname{Ker}(d\Phi(x, y))$ (which is equal to the restriction of the differential $d\mathbf{P}_Y(x, y)$ to $\operatorname{Ker}(d\Phi(x, y))$) is Fredholm and has index $\operatorname{Index}(df(x))$.
□

B Appendix: Slice theorem for actions of Lie groups on Banach manifolds

This appendix is written in terms of Section 2 in Appendix.B of [GuGiKa] by Guillemin-Ginzburg-Karshon. Let X be a connected Banach manifold, and a compact Lie group G smoothly acts on X by automorphisms of X. The **isotropy group** (or **stabilizer**) of a point $x \in X$ is

$$G_x = \{g \in G \,|\, g \cdot x = x\},$$

and the **orbit** of a point $x \in X$ is

$$G \cdot x = \{g \cdot x \,|\, g \in G\}.$$

The **orbit type** of a point $x \in X$ is defined to be the conjugacy class of its isotropy group G_x in G. Since $G_{g \cdot x} = gG_xg^{-1}$ the conjugacy class is constant along an orbit. For any subgroup $H \subset G$ let (H) denote the conjugacy class of H in G. We set

$$\begin{aligned} X_H &= \{x \in X \,|\, G_x = H\}, \\ X_{(H)} &= \{x \in X \,|\, G_x \,\text{is conjugate to}\, H\}. \end{aligned}$$

The fixed point set of a non-trivial subgroup $H \subset G$ is defined by

$$X^H := \{x \in X \,|\, g \cdot x = x \, \forall g \in H\}.$$

Theorem B.1 *For any $x \in X^G$ there exists a G-equivariant diffeomorphism from a neighborhood of the origin in T_xX onto a neighborhood of x in X.*

Proof. For any small G-invariant neighborhood U of x we can take a smooth map $f : U \to T_xX$ such that its differential at x is the identity map on T_xX. With the Haar measure dg of G we define the average of f over G as $F : U \to T_xX$,

$$F(y) = \int_G g_* f(g^{-1}y) dg.$$

(If G is a finite group F is defined by $F(y) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g_* f(g^{-1} \cdot y)$). Then $dF(x) = 1_{T_xX}$ and $F(h \cdot y) = h_*(F(y))$ for any $y \in U$ and $h \in G$. By the implicit function theorem there exists a small G-invariant neighborhood $V \subset U$ of x such that $F|_V : V \to F(V)$ is a diffeomorphism. Its inverse is a desired diffeomorphism. □

Theorem B.1 is often called the local linearization theorem.

The tangent space of an orbit $G \cdot x$ at x, $T_x(G \cdot x)$, is a G_x-invariant subspace of T_xX. Since $T_x(G \cdot x)$ is finite dimensional, elementary functional analysis arguments imply that there exists a direct sum decomposition $T_xX = T_x(G \cdot x) \oplus Y$. However Y is not necessarily G_x-invariant. Note that the direct sum decomposition $T_xX = T_x(G \cdot x) \oplus Y$ corresponds with bounded projection $P : T_xX \to T_x(G \cdot x)$ in a one-to-one way. We can average a projection by the G_x-action to get an G_x-invariant complement subspace Y of $T_x(G \cdot x)$, $T_xX = T_x(G \cdot x) \oplus Y$. Let W be an open G_x-invariant neighborhood of the origin in Y, and $G \times_{G_x} W$ be the associated bundle.

Theorem B.2 (Slice theorem) *For small W there exists a G-equivariant diffeomorphism Φ from the bundle $G\times_{G_x}W$ onto a neighborhood of the orbit $G{\cdot}x$ in X such that the restriction of it to the zero section $G\times_{G_x}\{0\} = G/G_x$ is given by*

$$G/G_x \to X, \quad gG_x \mapsto g\cdot x.$$

Proof. By Theorem B.1 there exists a G-equivariant diffeomorphism ϕ from a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the origin in T_xX onto a G-invariant neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of x in X. Shrink W so that $W\subset\mathcal{U}$, then the map

$$\Phi : G\times_{G_x}W \to X, \quad [g,\xi]\mapsto g\cdot\phi(\xi),$$

is well defined and is a local diffeomorphism at the point $[e,0]$. Here e is the unit in G. The G-equivariance implies that Φ is a local diffeomorphism at all points of the form $[e,0]$. Thus one only need to prove that Φ is one-to-one for sufficiently small W. The latter can be easily obtained by a contradiction argument because G is compact. $\square$

Using the slice theorem we easily derive:

Corollary B.3 *For any subgroup $H\subset G$ the set $X_{(H)}$ is a submanifold of X. If H is nontrivial then its fixed point set X^H is a disjoint union of closed submanifolds of X. Moreover, if the action of G is effective, $X^\circ := \{x\in X\,|\,G_x=\{1\}\}$ is an open and dense subset of X, and $X^{sing} := \{x\in X\,|\,G_x\neq\{1\}\}$ is equal to the union $\cup_{H\neq\{1\}}X^H$.*

Corollary B.4 *If the action of G on X is locally free, i.e., each point $x\in X$ has finite isotropy group G_x, then the quotient X/G is a Banach orbifold.*

C Appendix: Three results on linear functional analysis

All Banach spaces are real unless otherwise stated.

Proposition C.1 *Let $A : X\to Y$ be a bounded linear Fredholm operator of index r from Banach spaces X to Y. Assume that $H\subset X$ is a subspace of finite codimension $r'\geq 1$. Then the restriction $A|_H : H\to Y$ is also a Fredholm operator and* $\mathrm{Index}(A|_H) = r - r'$.

Proof. *Case 1.* $\mathrm{Ker}(A)\subset H$**.** We have direct sum decompositions $H = \mathrm{Ker}(A)\oplus H_1$ and $X = H\oplus X_1$. Then $A(X) = A(H_1)\oplus A(X_1)$. Since $\dim Y/A(X)$ is finite there exists a direct sum decomposition $Y = Y_1\oplus A(X) = Y_1\oplus A(H_1)\oplus A(X_1)$. Note that $A|_H(H) = A(H_1)$. We have $Y/\mathrm{Im}(A|_H)\cong Y_1\oplus A(X_1)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Index}(A|_H) &= \dim\mathrm{Ker}(A|_H) - \dim Y/\mathrm{Im}(A|_H)\\ &= \dim\mathrm{Ker}(A) - \dim(Y_1\oplus A(X_1))\\ &= \dim\mathrm{Ker}(A) - \dim Y_1 - \dim A(X_1)\\ &= r - r'.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $\mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H = \{0\}$**.** We have direct sum decompositions $X = H \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(A) \oplus H_2$ and $Y = Y_1 \oplus A(X) = Y_1 \oplus A(H_2) \oplus A(H)$. So $Y/A(H) \cong Y_1 \oplus A(H_2)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Index}(A|_H) &= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A|_H) - \dim Y/\mathrm{Im}(A|_H)\\
&= 0 - \dim(Y_1 \oplus A(H_2))\\
&= 0 - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - \dim H_2\\
&= -\dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - (r' - \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A))\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - r'\\
&= r - r'.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $\mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H \neq \{0\}$ **and** $\mathrm{Ker}(A)$ **can not be contained in** H**.** We have direct sum decompositions $\mathrm{Ker}(A) = \mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H \oplus Z$, $H = \mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H \oplus H_3$ and $X = H \oplus Z \oplus X_2$ and $Y = Y_1 \oplus A(X) = Y_1 \oplus A(X_2) \oplus A(H)$. So $Y/A(H) \cong Y_1 \oplus A(X_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Index}(A|_H) &= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A|_H) - \dim Y/\mathrm{Im}(A|_H)\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A|_H) - \dim(Y_1 \oplus A(X_2))\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - \dim A(X_2)\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - \dim X_2\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - (r' - \dim Z)\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) \cap H + \dim Z - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - r'\\
&= \dim \mathrm{Ker}(A) - \dim \mathrm{Coker}(A) - r'\\
&= r - r'.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Let X be a Banach space and $M \subset X$ be a closed subspace. $\mathrm{codim} M := \dim(X/M)$ is called codimension of M (in X). We have the following elementary fact, which is still proved for completeness.

Proposition C.2 *If the subspace $M \subset X$ has codimension $k \in [2, +\infty]$ then for any natural number $l \leq k$ there exists a closed subspace $X_0 \subset X$ of codimension l such that $M \subset X_0$.*

Proof. Since $M \subset X$ is a proper closed subspace there exists a nonzero $x_1 \in X$ such that $d_1 = \mathrm{dist}(x_1, M) > 0$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem we have $f_1 \in X^*$ such that $f_1(x_1) = 1$ and $f_1(M) = 0$. Let M_1 be the subspace spanned by M and x_1. It is a closed subspace of codimension $k-1$. If $l = 1$ or k we may take $X_0 = \mathrm{Ker}(f_1)$ or M. If $1 < l < k-1$ We can continue to choose a nonzero $x_2 \in X$ such that $d_2 = \mathrm{dist}(x_2, M_1) > 0$. Using the Hahn-Banach theorem again we get a $f_2 \in X^*$ such that $f_2(x_2) = 1$ and $f_2(M_1) = 0$. Note that f_1 and f_2 are linearly independent. Thus $\mathrm{Ker}(f_1) \cap \mathrm{Ker}(f_2)$ is a closed subspace of codimension 2 and contains M. If $l = 2$ we may take $X_0 = \mathrm{Ker}(f_1) \cap \mathrm{Ker}(f_2)$. If $l > 2$ we may continue this procedure.

After l steps we get l linearly independent vectors $x_1, \cdots, x_l$ and functionals $f_i \in X^*$, $i = 1, \cdots, l$ such that $f_i(x_i) = 1$ and $f_i(M_{i-1}) = 0$, where M_i is the subspace spanned by x_i and M_{i-1}, $i = 1, \cdots, l$ and $M_0 = M$. Clearly, $f_1, \cdots, f_l$ are linearly independent. Then $X_0 = \cap_{i=1}^l \mathrm{Ker}(f_i)$ is a desired closed subspace because any finite elements in $\{f_1, \cdots, f_l\}$ are also linearly independent. □

Proposition C.3 *Let G and H be two Banach spaces, and $A : G \to H$ be a bounded linear Fredholm operator. Suppose that $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$ is a direct sum decomposition of Banach spaces, and $P_i : H \to H_i$ are natural projections and $A_i = P_i \circ A$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $A_2 : G \to H_2$ is onto, then*

$$\tilde{A} : \mathrm{Ker}(A_2) = A^{-1}(H_1) \to H_1,\ x \mapsto A(x)$$

is a bounded linear Fredholm operator and $\mathrm{Ind}(\tilde{A}) = \mathrm{Ind}(A)$.

Proof. Denote by $A_i = P_i \circ A$, $i = 1, 2$. We first prove that $\tilde{A}$ has a closed range. Let $\{Ax_n\} \subset \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A})$ converge to $y \in H$. Since $\mathrm{Im}(A)$ is closed, there is a $x \in G$ such that $Ax = y$. Note that H_1 is closed and $Ax_n \in H_1$ for $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. We get $Ax = y \in H_1$, and thus $x \in A^{-1}(H_1)$. Hence $y \in \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A})$. Namely, $\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A})$ is closed.

Next it is clear that $\mathrm{Ker}(\tilde{A}) = \mathrm{Ker}(A)$ since $\mathrm{Ker}(A) \subset A^{-1}(H_1)$.

Finally, we prove $\mathrm{Coker}(\tilde{A}) = \mathrm{Coker}(A)$. Since $\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A}) \subset \mathrm{Im}(A)$ we have a well-defined linear map

$$\varphi : \mathrm{Coker}(\tilde{A}) = H_1/\mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A}) \to \mathrm{Coker}(A) = H/\mathrm{Im}(A),\ [y]_0 \mapsto [y],$$

where $[y]_0 = y + \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A})$ and $[y] = y + \mathrm{Im}(A)$. So it suffices to prove that φ is a linear isomorphism. Assume that $\varphi([y]_0) = 0$ for some $[y]_0 \in \mathrm{Coker}(\tilde{A})$. Then $[y] = 0$ and thus $y \in \mathrm{Im}(A)$, i.e., $y = Ax$ for some $x \in G$. Since $y \in H_1$, we get $A_2 x = 0$ or $x \in \mathrm{Ker}(A_2) = A^{-1}(H_1)$. Hence $y = Ax \in \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{A})$, i.e., $[y]_0 = 0$. This shows that φ is injective. To see that φ is also surjective, we take any $[y] \in \mathrm{Coker}(A)$. Decompose y into $y_1 + y_2$, where $y_i \in H_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Since A_2 is onto, we have $y_2 = A_2 x$ for some $x \in G$. Set $z = y_1 - A_1 x \in H_1$. Then $z - y = y_1 - A_1 x - y_1 - y_2 = -A_1 x - A_2 x = -Ax \in \mathrm{Im}(A)$. Hence $\varphi([z]_0) = [z] = [y]$. It follows that $\tilde{A}$ is Fredholm and has index $\mathrm{Ind}(\tilde{A}) = \mathrm{Ind}(A)$ because φ is a linear isomorphism. □

D Appendix: Existence of partially smooth cut-off functions in GW-theory

In this appendix we shall show how to construct desired PS cut-off functions. To limit the length of this paper we directly adopt the constructions in §2.4 of [Lu3]. Let $[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A)$ and $\mathbf{f} = (f; \Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ be a representative of it. Let $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \{y_1, \cdots, y_l\}$ be the set of all points added to Σ for stabilizing

$(\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$. Then $\sigma := (\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is a genus g stable curve with $m+l$ marked points. By (2.5) in [Lu3] we have a local deformation of σ:

$$V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}(\sigma) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m+l},\ (u,v) \mapsto [\Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}],$$

where $V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}(\sigma)$ is a small open neighborhood of the origin in some vector spaces of finite dimension. In §2.4.2 of [Lu3], for each $(u,v) \in V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}(\sigma)$ we constructed a map $f_{(u,v)} : \Sigma_{(u,v)} \to M$ satisfying

$$\mathrm{diam}_\mu(f_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)})) \le \mathrm{diam}_\mu(f(\Sigma)) + 4|v|^{1/4}$$

with respect to a fixed Riemannian distance d_M on M. By Remark 2.12 in [Lu3] we can choose a $\delta_{\mathbf{f}} > 0$ so small that the open ball $V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}}$ with center 0 and radius $\delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ is contained in $V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}$, and that each $\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)} = (f_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$, $(u,v) \in V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}}$, is a stable $L^{k,p}$-map and has the homology class A and the energy $E(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)}) \le \omega(A) + 1$ since $E(\mathbf{f}) = \omega(A)$. For $\epsilon > 0$ let $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\epsilon(\delta_{\mathbf{f}})$ by the set of all tuples $(g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfying the following conditions: (i) $(u,v) \in V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}}$, (ii) $g_{(u,v)} : \Sigma_{(u,v)} \to M$ is a $L^{k,p}$-map, (iii) $\|g_{(u,v)} - f_{(u,v)}\|_{k,p} < \epsilon$, where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{k,p}$ is measured with respect to the metrics $\tau_{(u,v)}$ and $g_J = \mu$. For each $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ we denote by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) := \{(g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\epsilon(\delta_{\mathbf{f}}) \,|\, (u,v) \in V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}},\ |(u,v)| < \delta\}$$

and by

$$\mathbf{U}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) := \{[g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \,|\, (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f})\} \subset \mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A}.$$

The latter is the desired neighborhood of $[\mathbf{f}] \in \mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A}$, and the $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f})$ is the uniformizer of $\mathbf{U}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f})$.

For $0 < \delta_0 \ll \delta$ and $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll \epsilon$ let us choose two smooth cut-off functions

$$\eta_1 : V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}} \to [0,1] \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2 : [0,+\infty) \to [0,1]$$

such that

$$\eta_1((u,v)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |(u,v)| \le \delta_0, \\ 0 & \text{if } |(u,v)| \ge 2\delta_0, \end{cases} \quad \eta_2(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \le t \le \epsilon_0^p, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \ge 2\epsilon_0^p. \end{cases}$$

Let us define $\eta : \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\eta(g_{(u,v)}) = \eta_1((u,v))\eta_2(\|g_{(u,v)} - f_{(u,v)}\|^p).$$

It is not hard to check that η is a partially smooth cut-off function on $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f})$. By shrinking $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ we can also require that its support is contained in a given small neighborhood of $\mathbf{f}$. As in §2.4.4 of [Lu3] let

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) := \{(g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) \,|\, g_{(u,v)}(y_j) \in H_j\ \forall y_j \in \bar{\mathbf{y}}\}$$

for $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ and small $\epsilon > 0$. Clearly, the above η restricts to a natural PS cut-off function on $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$. By the obvious averaging process we can get a $Aut(\mathbf{f})$-invariant PS cut-off function on $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta,\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$ from it.

References

[B] A. Borel, *Seminar on Transformation Groups*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1960.

[Bru] R. Brussee, *The canonical class and the C^∞-properties of Kähler surfaces*, New York J. Math., **2** (1996), 103-146.

[Chen] B. Chen et al, private communication.

[CMSa] K. Cieliebak, I. Mundet i Riera and D.A. Salamon, *Equivariant moduli problems, branched manifolds, and the Euler class*, Topology, **42** (2003), 641-700.

[DoKr] S.K. Donaldson and P.B. Kronheimer, *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1990.

[Dr] A. Dress, Newman's theorems of transformation groups, *Topology*, **8**(1969), 203-207.

[FuO] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, *Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant*, Topology, **38** (1999), 933-1048.

[GuGiKa] V. Guillemin, V. Ginzburg, Y. Karshon, *Moment maps, cobordisms, and Hamiltonian group actions*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **98**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

[Ho] H. Hofer, *A general Fredholm theory and applications*, SG/0509366.

[LeO] Lê Hông Vân and K. Ono, *Cup-length estimate for symplectic fixed points*, in *Contact and Symplectic Geometry*, 268-295, ed. by C. B. Thomas, Publication of the Newton Institute, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.

[LiT] J. Li and G. Tian, *Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of general symplectic manifolds*, in *Topic in symplectic 4-manifolds* (Irvine, CA, 1996), 47-83, First Int. Press Lect.Ser., I, Internatinal Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

[Liu] Gang Liu, *Associativity of Quantum multiplication*, Comm. Math. Phys., **191** (1998), 265-282.

[LiuT1] Gang Liu and Gang Tian, *Floer Homology and Arnold Conjecture*, J. Diff. Geom., **49** (1998), 1-74.

[LiuT2] Gang Liu and Gang Tian, *Weinstein Conjecture and GW Invariants*, Commun. Contemp. Math., **2** (2000), 405-459.

[LiuT3] Gang Liu and Gang Tian, *On the Equivalence of Multiplicative Structures in Floer Homology and Quantum Homology*, Acta Mathematicae Sinica, English Series, **15**(1999), 53-80.

[Lu1] Guangcun Lu, *Gromov-Witten invariants and rigidity of Hamiltonian loops with compact support on noncompact symplectic manifolds*, Commun. Anal. Geom., **9** (2001), 1041-1092.

[Lu2] Guangcun Lu, *An explicit isomorphism between Floer homology and quantum homology*, Pacific J. Math., **213** (2004), no. 2, 319-363.

[Lu3] Guangcun Lu, *Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of noncompact symplectic manifolds*, Commun. Math. Phys., **261** (2006), 43-131.

[LuW] Guangcun Lu and MingYan Wang, *The local inverse mapping theorem on Banach orbifolds*, to appear in the Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications.

[MaOu] J. Margalef-Roig and E.Outerelo Dominguez, *Differential Topology*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies **173**, North-Holland-Amsterdam.

[Mc1] D. McDuff, *The Virtual Module Cycle*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser2, **196**, 1999, 73-102.

[Mc2] D. McDuff, *Quantum homology of fibrations over* S^2, Intern. J. Math., **11** (2000), no. 5, 665-721.

[Mc3] D. McDuff, *Groupoids, branched manifolds and multisections*, math.SG/0509664 v1.

[McSa] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and quantum cohomology*, University Lec. Series, Vol. **6**, AMS.

[R1] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhood and the monopole equations*, in *Topic in symplectic* 4*-manifolds*(Irvine, CA, 1996), 101-124, First Int. Press Lect.Ser., I, Internatinal Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

[R2] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhood and pseudo-holomorphic curves*, Turkish J. Math., **23** (1999), 161-231.

[Sat1] I. Satake, *On a generalization of the notion of manifolds*, Proc. Nat. acad. Sci. USA, **2** (1956), 359-363.

[Sat2] I. Satake, *The Gauss-Bonnet theorem for V-manifolds*, Journal of Mathematical Society of Japan, **9** (1957), 464-492.

[Sch] M. Schwarz, *Equivalences for Morse homology*, in *Geometric Topology in Dynamics*, ed. Barge and Kuperberg, Contemporary Mathematics **246**, Amer. Math. Soc. 1999.

[Sie] B. Siebert, *Gromov-Witten invariants for general symplectic manifolds*, arXiv.org/dg-ga/9608005.

[Th] R. Thom, Sous-variétés et classes d'homologie des variétés différentiables. II. Résultates et applications. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **236** (1953), 573-575.

[Thu] W.P. Thurston, *Three-dimensional geometry and topology*, preliminary draft, University of Minnesota, Minnesota, 192.

[T] G. Tian, *Constructing symplectic invariants*, in *Quantum Cohomology*(P. de Bartolomeis, B. Dubrovin and C. Reina, eds.), Lecture Notes in Math., **1776**, 269-311.